

Gc
929.7201
Evlo
v.1

Gc
929.7201
Evlo
v.1
1267345

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 00726 8128

OUR OLD NOBILITY.

OUR OLD NOBILITY.

BY

NOBLESSE OBLIGE, &c. &c.

Howard Fin

V.1

SECOND EDITION.

London:

PUBLISHED FOR THE POLITICAL TRACT SOCIETY,


By E. J. KIBBLEWHITE,

37, TAVISTOCK STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.

1877.

PREFACE.

— 1267345

 HIS book is a reprint, with a few corrections and additions, of a series of articles which have appeared in the *Echo*. Should it meet with public approbation I intend in due time to reprint a second series which is now appearing every Saturday in the same journal.

I desire to express my obligations to Mr. Macqueen, Secretary of the Financial Reform Association, for the valuable information which he has compiled from the Landowners Return, and published in the *Financial Reformer* and *Financial Reform Almanack*. I have also to tender my thanks to various correspondents, some of them being members of the families of whom I have written, for information by which I have been enabled to correct and add to the original articles in the *Echo*. It has been my endeavour to state facts as accurately as possible, and scarcely any of the statements I have made have been called in question; in fact the only important correction which I have been compelled to make was in regard to a living duke, who is credited in a County History with having discharged his father's debts. Unpaid

creditors having written to me denying this, I have been obliged to withdraw the statement. If, inadvertently, I have done any person injustice I should be the first to regret it; but on the other hand there are many unfavourable facts of which I am morally certain, but which I have refrained from stating in the absence of proof.

Possibly when my present work is completed I may have something to say upon the Land Question in general. At present I am content to give my readers facts, and leave them to draw their own conclusions.

CONTENTS.


CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE FITZROYS	I
II. „ BENTINCKS	5
III. „ NORTHS	9
IV. „ RUSSELLS	14
V. „ CHURCHILLS	19
VI. „ HOWARDS	24
VII. „ COKES	29
VIII. „ SUTHERLAND-LEVESON-GOWERS	33
IX. „ (EXETER) CECILS	38
X. „ FANES	43
XI. „ PELHAM-CLINTONS	47
XII. „ DIGBYS	52
XIII. „ MANNERS FAMILY	56
XIV. „ (SALISBURY) CECILS	61
XV. „ HERBERTS	67
XVI. „ SACKVILLE-WESTS	70
XVII. „ SCOTTS	75
XVIII. „ PAGETS	80
XIX. „ FITZWILLIAMS	84
XX. „ BATHURSTS	90
XXI. „ OSBORNES	95
XXII. „ MANNERS-SUTTONS	100
XXIII. „ GRENVILLES	105

CHAP.		PAGE
XXIV.	THE PARKERS	109
XXV.	„ STANHOPEs	114
XXVI.	„ MONTAGUS	118
XXVII.	„ LENNOXES	122
XXVIII.	„ NEVILLS	127
XXIX.	„ CAVENDISHES	132
XXX.	„ SCOTTS OF ELDON	138
XXXI.	„ SEYMOURS	143
XXXII.	„ VANE-TEMPESTS	148
XXXIII.	„ PERCIES	153
XXXIV.	„ AMHERSTS	159
XXXV.	„ HOBARTS	163
XXXVI.	„ ADDINGTONS	168
XXXVII.	„ CONYNGHAMS	173
XXXVIII.	„ FINCHES	177
XXXIX.	„ LOWTHERS	181
XL.	„ GROSVENORS	187
XLI.	„ BERESFORDS	192
XLII.	„ BEAUCLERKS	197
XLIII.	„ WODEHOUSES	202
XLIV.	„ LEGGES	207
XLV.	„ BLIGHS	211
XLVI.	„ TOLLEMACHES	215
XLVII.	„ CAMPBELLS	220
XLVIII.	„ COWPERS	225
XLIX.	„ SPENCERS	229
L.	„ BUTE-STUARTS	233
LI.	„ STEWART-MURRAYS	238
LII.	„ COURTENAYS	245

OUR OLD NOBILITY.

I.

The Fitzroys.

HE Dukedom of Grafton is a very fair sample of the bastard peerages, of which there are several. The Duke's possessions are very extensive,—13,642 acres in Suffolk, 8,458 in Northamptonshire, 7,316 in Bucks, and 2,784 in Banffshire—32,200 acres in all. He is also hereditary Ranger of Whittlebury and Salcey Forests, an office which gives him the right of cutting underwood and exercising other privileges over some few thousand acres besides. Whittlebury Forest, by the way, has furnished the Fitzroys with the sites of two handsome residences, in which the Duke and his brother reside, and which have attached to them five or six hundred acres of pasture-land. The Duke has also a seat at Euston Hall, in Suffolk, and valuable landed property in London, the locality of which is indicated by the family names of Grafton Street and Fitzroy Square. His Grace receives a pension of £843 per annum as a retired diplomatist; and his brother, Lord Augustus Fitzroy, who is a major-general, has been an equerry to the Queen since 1849, with a salary of £750.

The Fitzroys are certainly descended from one of the vilest of women, Barbara Palmer, wife of Lord Castlemaine, and mistress of Charles II., and they are probably descended from Charles II. also, though, as Barbara was false alike to her husband and her royal lover, it is impossible to speak with certainty. Charles very considerably fathered his bastards on

the nation ; in those days an illegitimate son of the monarch had better provision made for him than a younger legitimate son of the monarch at the present time.

One of Charles's Ministers was Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, whose only daughter was married at the mature age of twelve to young Fitzroy, the son of Barbara Palmer and Charles II. Ample provision was made for the young couple. In 1673 Charles granted to the Earl of Arlington for life, and to Fitzroy and his wife afterwards, a very extensive tract of Crown land, viz., the lordship and manor of Grafton, manor of Hartwell, and lands in Hartwell, Roade, and Hanslope, manors of Alderton, Blisworth, Stoke Bruerne, Green's Norton, Potterspury, Ashton, Panlerspury, part of Chacombe Priory, lands in Grimscott, Houghton Parva, Northampton, Hardington, and Shuttlehanger, parcel of Swardsley Priory, the office and fee of the honour of Grafton, and the forests of Salcey and Whittlebury (reserving the timber to the Crown). This extraordinary grant will account for the large estates of the Fitzroys in Northamptonshire and Bucks.

The Fitzroys inherit their Suffolk estates from the Earl of Arlington. This patriotic statesman, who formed one of the notorious Cabal Ministry, not content with taking bribes from the King of France, not content with the lucrative posts of Secretary of State, Keeper of the Privy Purse, and Postmaster-General—managed to secure for himself a number of valuable grants, as is shown by the State papers in the Record Office, among which were a moiety of the estates of a former Earl of Lenox, and several manors in the county of Wicklow. He also obtained a lease of Marylebone Park on advantageous terms, and another lease of three-fourths of Great St. John's Wood at an annual rental of £21 6s. 2d. No wonder that he was able to purchase Euston Hall and the surrounding lands. One of his Suffolk lordships was formerly part of the possessions of St. Edmund's Abbey, though whether acquired by grant or purchase is not clear. Charles II. was not content with giving away Crown lands in the wholesale manner above described ; the children of his harlots were further provided for at the public expense. The Duke of Grafton, for instance, had an hereditary pension of £9,000 a year granted from the Excise, and £4,700 a year from the Post Office, which continued to be paid till a comparatively recent date. There was also a very lucrative sinecure in the family, which the Duke of

The Fitzroys.

Grafton surrendered in 1795, for an annuity of £870 a year—an arrangement ratified by the Act 46 Geo. III., cap. 89.

Whittlebury Forest was formerly one of the most extensive of the Royal domains, and furnished a large quantity of timber for the Navy; it is now comparatively small. An inquiry was made into its management in the latter part of the last century, and though the Commissioners in their report of 1792-3 whitewashed the Duke of Grafton, the hereditary ranger, yet the facts showed clearly enough that the forest had been scandalously mismanaged, and the Crown grossly defrauded, for while in 1608 it contained 51,046 timber oaks, in 1783 it contained but 5,211. The Crown had only reserved the timber; everything else that could be got out of the forest went to the Duke of Grafton; and the natural result of the divided ownership was that the portion of the Crown greatly diminished. It was the old story of the cattle of Jacob and Laban over again. And, to make the case still worse, though the original grant reserved the timber to the Crown, the Dukes of Grafton had managed to get paid for it out of the revenue. One specimen of the conduct of the hereditary rangers of Whittlebury Forest, in regard to its management, must suffice. In the early part of the reign of George III., the Navy was greatly in want of timber, and a survey was made of all the timber in the Royal forests, including Whittlebury. A warrant was issued from the Treasury to cut down a quantity of trees in Whittlebury; but as the unfortunate official who was charged with the execution of the order did not bring the warrant in his pocket, the Duke of Grafton stopped him in his work, and insisted on his dismissal from the public service. Junius, writing on this transaction, exclaims, "In what language shall I address so black, so cowardly a tyrant? The Lords of the Treasury recall their warrant; the Deputy-Surveyor is ruined for doing his duty; the oaks keep their ground: the king is defrauded; and the Navy of England may perish for want of the best and finest timber in the island. And all this submitted to, to appease the Duke of Grafton; to justify the man who has involved the King and his kingdom in confusion and distress; and who, like a treacherous coward, deserted his master in the midst of it." It would be regarded as invidious if this incident were adduced as a fair specimen of the patriotism of the great houses, though unfortunately not a few similar instances might be produced. This man, who succeeded in defrauding the

king of the timber urgently required, was at that very time receiving no less than £18,770 a-year in hereditary pensions, and £3,780 a-year as Receiver-General of the Profits of the Seals in the King's Bench and Common Pleas, besides £236 a-year from the Crown as a salary for taking care of Whittlebury, while the Crown paid two deputies £130 a year each to do the work for him. Taking into consideration the history of the Fitzroys from the foundation of the House by a Royal bastard, to their administration of the Royal Forest of Whittlebury at the close of last century, the family motto, "The ornament and reward of virtue," sounds absolutely ludicrous.

II.

The Bentincks.



THE Duke of Portland is one of the richest noblemen in England. He owns 81, 605 acres in Caithness, 35,209 in Notts, 10,822 in Northumberland, and 7,740 in Derbyshire—153,163 acres in all, exclusive of large estates in one of the best quarters of London. Since the Return of Landowners was made, the Duke has made still further purchases of land in Caithness. His town mansion extends along a whole side of Cavendish-square ; and, beside two seats in Scotland, he has a splendid mansion at Welbeck Abbey, Notts. Welbeck is said to be the finest woodland domain in England. Within its noble park, eight miles in circumference, is a lake a mile long. All this property has been acquired within the last two hundred years. No other noble house has attained to such vast possessions in so short a space of time.

The founder of the house, a Dutchman, was the confidential friend of William III. The King created him successively a Baron, a Viscount, and an Earl, and as William lavished on his favourites large sums from the Tenth and First-fruits, no doubt he obtained still more solid proofs of the Royal favour. But Bentinck was inordinately greedy, and his rapacity soon provoked the anger of the House of Commons. We are told in Volume 5 of "Parliamentary History" that the Earl of Portland begged of His Majesty the lordships of Denbigh, Bromfield, Yale, and other lands in the Principality of Wales, which his Majesty readily granted to him and his heirs for ever at an annual rental of 6s. 8d. Such a monstrous alienation of the property of the Crown was more than Parliament could tolerate. The Commons had been already incensed by the gifts lavished on the King's favourites, and when the rapacious Dutchman begged four-fifths of a whole county, the House unanimously voted an address to the Crown against the grant. The King was obliged to recall his gift, but a few months after he gave to the Earl, as we are informed on the same authority,

1. The Manor of Grantham ; 2. The Honour of Penrith ; 3. The Manor of Dracklow and Rudneth ; 4. The Manor of Terrington ; 5. The Manor of Partington ; 6. The Manor of Bristol Garth ; 7. The Manor of Harnsey ; 8. The Manor of Burnisley ; 9. The Manor of Leven (all part and parcel of the ancient revenue of England, which, Sir Robert Cotton tells us, it was, in olden times, held impious to touch ; 10. The Manor of Pevensey ; 11. The Manor of East Greenwich ; besides certain fee-farm rents, worth at that time £24,000. Several of these Manors have been sold or exchanged since that time, the Honour of Penrith, for instance, was sold in 1787 to the Duke of Devonshire and others. Two vain attempts were made in the House of Commons during the reign of Queen Anne to rescind these grants, the movers in the matter rightly maintaining that to alienate so much land from the Crown involved a corresponding increase in public taxation. The ancient Crown lands held by the Bentincks are very similar to the hereditary pension of the Churchills. In both cases the nation pays—land in one case, hard cash in the other.

The wealth of the Bentincks has been augmented by successive marriages with great heiresses. The first of these was the grand-daughter of Holles, Duke of Newcastle, who brought into the family a large part of that nobleman's property. I presume most of the 7,740 acres in Derbyshire come from that source, for the lady in question was possessed of Bolsover Castle and other estates in that county, most of which one of her ancestors had obtained by a grant from the boy-King Edward VI. Welbeck Abbey, too, the chief seat of the Bentincks, which, as its name denotes, was formerly monastic property, was given by Henry VIII. to one of this lady's ancestors, as is duly recorded in "Tanner's Notitia." I believe the Marylebone property in London was honestly bought by the Duke of Newcastle for a small sum. By another marriage the Bentincks acquired the ancient Barony of Ogle, part of the spoil of the Norman Conquest, which accounts for the 10,822 acres they hold in Northumberland. By another marriage, with the heiress of General Scott, of Fifeshire, they acquired large property in Scotland. The Caithness estates are mainly modern purchases by the present Duke, who has so much money that the only use he can find for it is to build underground rooms and passages at Welbeck, acquire large deer-forests in the Highlands of Scotland, and suscribe lavishly to Turkish

violators and murderers. The marriage of one of the Bentincks with Miss Scott afforded another good opportunity for a dip into the national revenue. Miss Scott was proprietor of an island in Scotland, on which was erected a lighthouse, which had existed there for 173 years. It was a very unsteady light in bad weather, and at such times, when it was most wanted, it was apt to be mistaken for a limekiln or an accidental fire. Its chief use apparently was to furnish an excuse for collecting light-dues. The Commissioners of Northern Lights had legal powers to compel the owners to make it more effective, powers which they did not, however, exercise. The way in which an efficient lighthouse was obtained was as follows:—An Act of Parliament was passed by which the heir of the House of Bentinck obtained a sum of £60,000 for his interest in the light, and then another light was constructed in its stead, at the public expense, at a cost of £30,000 more.

I have thus shown that the enormous landed property of the Bentincks is derived mainly from grants of Crown lands or of monastic property, or from the ancient spoil of the Norman Conquest. If the Bentincks have acquired much by purchase, it may be easily accounted for from the fact that the whole family have constantly endeavoured to live out of public taxation. Thus I find, from the *Spectator* of 1831, that one Duke of Portland held in succession no less than fourteen public offices. At the same time a younger son of the same house was Governor-General of India—salary about £30,000 a year and perquisites; Clerk of the Pipe—salary £1,131 a year; and Colonel of Dragoons, salary £2,511 a year—£33,641 a year in all. A brother-in-law of the Duke held places worth £2,050 a year, a nephew places worth £5,000 a year, another nephew a place worth £250 a year, while a daughter had an annual pension of £233. The acquisition of a large number of public offices was not the only way in which the Bentinck family used their large political influence for their own advantage. Like the Russells and the Grosvenors, they could get one-sided Acts of Parliament passed in their own interest. For instance, the Dukes of Portland were formerly lay-rectors of Marylebone. As the population was growing very rapidly, at the commencement of the present century certain Acts of Parliament were passed from 1806 to 1817 for the erection and endowment of four new churches, at an estimated cost to the ratepayers of £170,000. The rate-payers were

to find the money, but the Duke of Portland was to have the right of presentation to the several benefices. During a portion of this period, from 1806 to 1817, the Duke of Portland was one of the chief Ministers for the Crown. His incapacity was notorious, and he is represented in one of the caricatures of the period as a block of Portland stone, against which the people are breaking their shins. He had, however, sufficient capacity to look after his own interest. Soon after his death, the Act of 1817 was passed, which authorised the expenditure of £40,000 raised by the sale of Crown lands, in order to buy from the Duke of Portland his rights as rector and the patronage of the four district churches. By this beautiful arrangement the Duke was paid by the nation, not only for his property as lay-rector, but for the valuable patronage which had been very recently created by the taxation of the parishioners.

One would have thought that the Dukes of Portland were rich enough to pay a fair price for a London mansion. Yet I find that in 1773 the Duke of Portland obtained a lease of a mansion at Whitehall for a term of fifty years, the annual value of which was £200. For this mansion he paid £180 cash down, and £5 a year for the first twenty-five years, and £25 a year for the remaining twenty-five years. The same Duke's mother had also a mansion at Whitehall, leased about the same time for a similar term, worth £126 a year, for which she paid no cash down, and only £24 16s. 8d. a year rent. The Duke, who paid £5 a-year rent for his town mansion, distinguished himself by setting up an unfounded claim to the soil of part of Sherwood Forest, though it was shown that John Holles, Duke of Newcastle, from whom he derived his Nottinghamshire property by marriage, himself recognised the right of the Crown to this very land. These profitable bargains in Crown lands are duly set forth in the Report of the Commissioners on Crown Land, 1792-3, and the Report of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, 1830-1. Such is the history of the great House of Bentinck, so far as regards their landed possessions. Of their political history, the less said the better. One of the family was prime minister for a short time, in the dark days of oppression and injustice at the early part of the present century; another is known only as the bitter and unscrupulous opponent of Sir Robert Peel, when that great statesman abolished the Bread Tax.

III.

The Norths.



THE history of this remarkable family should be studied by every worshipper of ignoble success. Since the days of Henry VIII. it has obtained two peerages. The present holder of the first is Francis Dudley North, seventh Earl of Guilford, of Waldershare Park, Dover, and Glenham Hall, Suffolk, owner of 8,065 acres in Kent, and 2,864 in Suffolk, and patron of nine livings. The other peerage is held by Baroness North, of Putney, S.W., and Wroxton Abbey, near Banbury. Colonel North, M.P. for Oxfordshire, is the husband of the Baroness. He is not a North by birth ; his name originally was Doyle. Of course he has as much right to change his patronymic to that of North as the publican had to change his from Bugg to Norfolk-Howard, only it seems rather odd that anyone should desire to change his name to North. Possibly the Colonel is unacquainted with history. The first Lord North was one of the greedy crew who swarmed round Henry VIII. at the dissolution of the monasteries. He came of a decent family, studied for the law, and got a good start in life by marrying a rich widow, each of whose two former husbands had left her a fortune. His first office was Clerk of the House of Commons. Henry having established a Court of Augmentations to look after the plundered property of the Church, North became treasurer, and subsequently chancellor, of this Court, the king making him large grants of land out of the suppressed monasteries, as shown in Dugdale's Monasticon. In the reign of Edward VI., North being a Privy Councillor, signed a subscription by which he engaged to support Lady Jane Grey's title to the Crown, while he was secretly corresponding with the Princess Mary. When Mary became Queen he supported her, turned Catholic, became a bitter persecutor of the Protestants, and was created a Peer—but he stuck to the Church lands which he had acquired. At Queen Elizabeth's accession Lord North was dismissed from the Privy Council, and not long afterwards

died. Two of the rectories he obtained he gave to Cambridge University, for which piece of generosity one of his descendants praises him highly. Well, a man who acquired ill-gotten gains by thousands could afford to give away a few hundreds easily. Of his heirs for a generation or two there is nothing to be said. One of them, in 1658, wrote, "I know not of any of the race that have as yet applied themselves to courses dishonest or dishonourable." What would he have said if he had written two hundred years later?

The fourth Lord North had five sons, the second of whom was created Lord Guilford. He was a drunkard and a libertine. Macaulay says of him: "As Chief Justice of the Common Pleas he was party to some of the foulest judicial murders recorded in history," and that "his life was sullied by cowardice, selfishness, and servility," which, indeed, seem to have been the distinguishing qualities of the whole tribe. His brother, Sir Dudley North, Sheriff of London, was a wretch who, still to quote Macaulay, "was the unscrupulous slave of the Government, and joined to lax principles an unfeeling heart. His juries never failed to find verdicts of guilty, and, on a day of judicial butchery, carts loaded with the legs and arms of quartered Whigs were driven to his fine house in Basinghall Street for orders." Of course both the brothers secured highly-paid offices. A third brother used his pen to defend the worst abominations of the Government of Charles II.; a fourth held a number of rich preferments in the Church. Lord Guilford married Lady Frances Pope, whose ancestor, like his own, was a plunderer of monasteries, and held Tittenhanger and Wroxton Abbeys, as we are told by Tanner, in his "*Nobilia Monastica*." Wroxton Abbey remains in the family still.

The second Lord Guilford did nothing remarkable except getting a rich Government office. The third lord succeeded to both peerages, the elder line having died out. He, being an assiduous hanger-on at Court, was created Earl of Guilford. His elder son, Lord North, was Prime Minister to George III.; the descendants of his younger son, Brownlow, now hold the Guilford peerage. The former was a bigoted Tory, opposed to every popular measure. His chief distinction is that he led England into a war with the American Colonies, which cost this country a disgraceful defeat and several millions of debt, and that he held about a dozen public offices. Mr. J. R.

Green says that "the period of Lord North's Administration was the darkest hour of English history." His line died out, so we have to do with the younger brother, Brownlow North, who went into the Church, and was fortunate enough to have a brother who was Prime Minister.

Whatever may be the faults of the Church of England to-day, it is as pure as snow compared with the Church of the last century, for the aristocracy had made it the biggest den of thieves in the country. Even in that corrupt time Brownlow's rapid promotion was regarded as a scandal, and Lord North's own colleagues protested against it; but he coolly told them that when Brownlow became of mature age he would not have a brother for Prime Minister. Brownlow North was born in 1741; at 29 he was made a Canon, at 29½ a Dean, at 30 a Bishop, at 33 he was promoted to a richer diocese, and at 40 he was translated to Winchester, the most lucrative See in England. He held the Bishopric of Winchester for 40 years, and netted from the revenues of that diocese more than a million and a half sterling. This prelate did nothing for the Church except to quarter all his relations upon it—sons, sons-in-law, and nephews, all are amply provided for. About the end of last century some 30 church livings and dignities were held by this ravenous family. Brownlow North actually installed one of his sons into two diocesan offices when the boy was but seven years old. The worst case, however, was that of his son Francis, who subsequently became Earl of Guilford, at the death of a cousin who left only two daughters, one of whom is the present Baroness North. Francis was brought up to the church and went into Holy Orders. This reverend earl appears to have combined the virtues of Ahab, Gehazi, Ananias, and Simon Magus. To meanness he added greediness—and to greediness, falsehood—and to falsehood, fraud. Before he was forty his father the Bishop had made him rector of New and Old Alresford, with the chapelry of Medstead, precentor and rector of St. Mary, Southampton, and Master of St. Cross Hospital, with St. Faith's; and he subsequently also held a prebend's stall at Winchester. Up to 1853 he had received from Alresford £84,800, to say nothing of house glebe and fees; from St. Mary, Southampton, £121,000, with similar perquisites; from the prebend's stall £19,000, and from St. Cross Hospital £90,000—not far from £350,000 in all. All this was proved

in 1853 by Mr. Richard Andrews, of Southampton, and the Rev. H. Holloway, who fearlessly exposed the doings of the reverend earl.

When it was complained that the Earl could not hold St. Cross and Alresford at the same time, he declared that he was not inducted into it as an ecclesiastical benefice; when his maladministration of St. Cross was brought before the Law Courts, he swore that it was an ecclesiastical benefice, and so beyond their jurisdiction. He seems to have conspired with his father to have been inducted in such a manner as to defeat the law, and enable him to hold both offices. But the worst has yet to be told. It was bad enough that he should take thousands of pounds every year from the Church, and pay one curate £24 and another £70 for doing his work, but the £90,000 he had from St. Cross was the property of the poor, and it was fully proved before the Rolls Court that he had defrauded this noble charity in spite of the original foundation and of an Act of Parliament. The value of the property had grown immensely, and while he continued to pay the small number of pensioners named by the founders, he put the balance in his own pocket, although he knew that the foundation expressly provided that all the balance should be spent in charitable works. This went on from 1808 down to 1853, when the Rolls Court interfered and compelled him to disgorge a small part of the plunder. The Master of the Rolls said of this reverend Earl and his doings:—"The shameless perversion of one of our noblest charities has been done under a system which not even the most unscrupulous cupidity could have carried out till hardened into a contempt for common decency." The *Times* said—"Can he expect to be considered an honest man, or go down to the grave with anything but a dishonoured name and an evil fame too well-deserved, should he leave to his own offspring the property which he has accumulated by depriving the needy of their inheritance?" It need hardly be added that he refunded as little as possible, and left to his own offspring nearly all his ill-gotten gains. The then Attorney-General, now Chief Justice Cockburn, stated in Court, quoting from the original documents, that the objects of the charity were to provide for thirteen poor and needy men within the walls, and 100 poor men without the walls of the hospital, "and, after such provision, the surplus or remaining funds were to be distributed in general charity to

the needy of every description for ever." The only defence of the Earl was, first, that the Court had no jurisdiction, and second, that two or three of his predecessors had robbed the poor also. The Court ordered that the wretched old man should render back so much of the funds as he had taken between 1849 and 1853. We have thus seen whence the Norths have derived the major part of their wealth.

If one of the mottos of this noble house be true, viz., "Virtue is the only nobility," then there has been precious little nobility in the North family. We have seen that from the rise of the house, in the time of Henry VIII., they have been spoilers of the Church, greedy courtiers, corrupt Judges, incapable Statesmen, contemptible sycophants, robbers of the poor, and, as such, have constantly grown in wealth and dignity. We may look in vain for one amongst them who has rendered any distinguished service to the country. The Norths have never held a Judgeship, or a great office in the State, or a position of prominence in the Church, but they have used it in the basest and most unscrupulous manner to feather their own nest.

IV

The Russells.



SPITE of their singular fatalist motto, *Che sara sara* ("What will be, will be"), the Russells have always been active in politics, and almost invariably on the side of progress. Among all the great houses not one has rendered to the people such noble services as the Russells, though, by the way, these services have been rendered rather by the cadets than by the heads of the house. I believe that the Russells bear quite as honourable a name as landlords as they do as politicians, and my own observation of the farms and cottages on their estates confirms that impression. But our present inquiry is rather as to the sources whence the vast landed possessions of this house were derived.

"The Duke of Bedford," says Edmund Burke, "is the leviathan of all the creatures of the Crown. . . . The grants to the House of Bedford were so enormous as not only to outrage economy, but to stagger credibility." The same great writer thus describes the conduct of the founder of the family: "The political merit of the first pensioner of the house of Bedford was that of being concerned as a Councillor of State in advising, and in his person executing, the conditions of a dishonourable peace with France—by instigating a tyrant to injustice to provoke a people to rebellion—by giving his hand to the work and partaking the spoil with a prince who plundered a part of the National Church of his time and country—by being a prompt and greedy instrument of a leveling tyrant who oppressed all descriptions of his people. His grants were from the aggregated and consolidated funds of judgments iniquitously legal, and from possessions voluntarily surrendered by their lawful proprietors with the gibbet at the door. . . . His merits were by acts in which he served his master and made his fortune to bring poverty, wretchedness, and depopulation on his country."

John Russell's first grant was from the forfeited estates of the Duke of Buckingham, who had been judicially murdered. In 1540 he obtained a grant of the whole site and circuit of

the rich Abbey of Tavistock, consisting of 25 manors in Devonshire and one in Cornwall, great part of the town and hundred of Tavistock, besides other lands in Devon and Somerset. The same year he obtained a grant of the manor of Aston Abbotts, Bucks, part of the confiscated lands of St. Albans, also a grant of Dunkeswell, Devon. Two years after he obtained in the same manner Hagh, in Lincolnshire, and Castle Hymel, Northamptonshire, besides a house at Exeter. Henry VIII. was succeeded by his son Edward VI., a boy of ten, who died at sixteen. Nothing can equal the greed of the vulture statesmen who governed England in Edward's name, unless it be the conduct of the gang of swindlers, cut-throats, and harlots who crowded round Napoleon III. during the period of his successful crime. Henry had received a large share of the Abbey lands from the Crown. To take from them was to take from the nation, for the smaller the Crown estates the more money had to be obtained by taxation. It is said that Henry had intended to make fresh grants, but Edward's Ministers were already well provided for. They had been loaded with wealth and honours by their late master; but they were as insatiate as leeches. In the very first year of Edward's reign, Russell being a member of the Council, obtained a grant of the site and most of the lands belonging to Woburn Abbey. Two years after he obtained a grant of Melchburn Priory, Beds, and of Thorney, or Thornhaugh, Northamptonshire. A year or two after he obtained a grant of lands formerly belonging to the monks of Westminster, consisting of a plot called Sevenacres or Long-acre, and Covent-garden. The present value of this estate must be something fabulous. Hume tells us that in 1544 an acre of good land in Cambridgeshire let at a shilling, or about fifteenpence of our present money. An acre of good land now lets for from thirty shillings to forty shillings, so that we shall not be far out in taking the present value of these grants at thirty times the original valuation. At this rate John Russell's grants and their annual value stand as follows, Tanner's "*Notitia Monastica*" being the authority for the original values:—

Tavistock (Devon)	£27,060
Thorney (Northamptonshire)	15,240
Woburn (Beds)	12,900
Dunkeswell (Devon)	8,940
Melchburn (Beds)	7,230
Castle Hymel (Northamptonshire)	1,860

besides a priory at Exeter and another at Hagh whose values are not given, and the great Covent-garden estate, which must be now worth nearer three hundred than thirty times its original value.

The Bloomsbury estates came from the same source as the rest of the Bedford property. Wriothesley, another of the creatures of Henry VIII., rose into power and wealth by the dissolution of the monasteries, having obtained grants of sites and lands in Hampshire and elsewhere. One of Wriothesley's descendants was created Earl of Southampton; for want of a male heir the peerage became extinct. But one of the Russells married a daughter and co-heir of the house, who brought with her the Bloomsbury and Hampshire estates. The latter have since been sold to the Barings and others.

There is no doubt that, with the exception alluded to, the greater part of these lands are still held by the Russells. In the recent return of landowners the Duke of Bedford is set down as holding 86,424 acres in eight counties. The 33,589 acres in Beds and 3,036 in Bucks are mostly the spoil of Woburn and Melchburn; the 18,800 acres in Northamptonshire, 3,415 in another county, and 1,334 in Hunts, the spoils of Thorney and Castle Hymel; the 22,607 acres in Devon, the spoils of Tavistock and Dunkeswell.

The land-tax, as originally fixed, was four shillings in the pound; it now varies, in different counties, from fivepence three-farthings to seven-sixteenths of a penny. Taking one estate with another, the Duke of Bedford pays on his different estates, outside the Metropolis, rather less than fourpence in the pound; inside the Metropolis one penny and three-eighths.

It was said by a writer towards the close of last century that a fifth of London had been built on the ducal property within two hundred years. The usual plan of leviathan London landowners is to grant building leases for a certain term, with very stringent conditions, and at the close of the term the houses built upon their lands become their own property. By this delightful arrangement, without the outlay of a sixpence on their own part, they cover their lands with houses at high ground rents, which in due course become their own property. The people of London are helpless, being obliged to live or carry on their business within a given area, and the land monopolists know that the people cannot multiply the land. If legislation

were just, the State would tax this unearned increase, every penny of which comes from the industry of the people.

But the great landowners of London have not been content with the power their land monopoly gave them to absorb many millions annually from the hard-working population of London. A man who builds a new street in the suburbs of London has to properly make the road before it is handed over to the parish. The Grosvenors and Bentincks, the Calthorpes and Southamptons, the Portmans and Bedfords—who could do what they liked in the landlords' Parliaments of fifty or a hundred years ago—divested themselves even of this obligation. Mr. John Macdonell, in his able work on the land question, thus speaks of the Bedford property :—" Anyone who examines the local or private measures, passed for the most part in the reigns of George III. and George IV., in order to 'pave, cleanse, light, water, and embellish' various squares in London, will find them studded with acts of favouritism to landlords. . . . The ratepayers, in short, were mulcted in order to improve and embellish the landowners' estates. It is true they have occasionally done a little paving. Thus the Duke of Bedford went to some expense with respect to Oakley-square, but I find that the Vestry of St. Pancras repaid him. . . . In the urban domains of the Duke of Bedford (and others) there are erected gates which are closed at early, odd, and inconvenient hours, and which vindicate the seigniorial rights to treat some of the populous districts of London as if they were private gardens. At not a few turnings stand ducal beables, ready to turn back plebeian vehicles, and to bar the way against short cuts at late hours or early hours. A recent Parliamentary Return showed the number of these gates to be very great, especially on the Bedford estate. . . . It was by the same legislation that it came to pass that St. Pancras alone had sixteen Paving Boards, eleven of which, filled with nominees of the freeholder, were self-elected. The Metropolis Local Management Act swept these Boards away, and the sole reminiscence of these extinct bodies consists of the bond debts which they incurred, and which still remain to burden certain districts. What is the net result of the history? This: By private Acts the proprietors originally got their estates paved by the occupiers; the maintenance and repair of the streets, from which the public are partially excluded, is and was the work of the public, each district receiving the

benefit of the general rate levied on the whole of the Metropolis; and, to complete the job, the value of the streets is artificially enhanced by the maintenance of gates, which, giving privacy, enable the freeholder to exact a higher rent. . . . On the Duke of Bedford's estate within the jurisdiction of St. Pancras there is a debt of £26,374, and a rate of 3d. in the pound designed to act as a sinking-fund."

The Russells have now and then transacted a little business in Crown Lands, as shown in the Reports of the Commissioners on Crown Lands, 1792-93. For instance, the Duke of Bedford obtained in 1771 a lease of the Honour of Ampthill, in the counties of Beds, Bucks, and Herts, consisting of the manors of Ampthill, Milbrook, Stevingley, Camelton and Stretford, Newenham and Dunstable, with divers lands and tenements therein. This lease, granted in 1771, expired in 1839, a term of 58 years. The annual value, according to the Government estimate, was £508. The Duke of Bedford paid £940 cash down, £10 3s. 4d. a year for 40 years, and £50 a year for the remaining 17 years. In 1696 Mr. Edward Russell, who conducted the negotiations with William III. which led to the Revolution of 1688, obtained a lease, which terminated in 1819, of three acres of the best building land in London, which included Great and Little Suffolk Streets, Pall-mall. He was to have the land for thirty-three years at an annual rent of £1, paying a fine of £7,660. In consideration of Mr. Edward Russell's valuable services the fine, however, was never enforced. In 1786 this land was worth £1,750 a year. One or two other comfortable little transactions in Crown lands might be cited, but for the most part the Russells have been content with the original grants—and well they might be!

The Churchills.

IN modern times there have been four principal avenues to the peerage—War, Law, Wealth, and Statesmanship. Certainly War has had at least a fair share of modern creations. The Wellington, Anglesey, Combermere, St. Vincent, Howe, Hood, Nelson, Lawrence, Hawke, Hill, Hardinge, Sandhurst, Napier, Raglan, Strathnairn, and many other peerages are of this order. Most extravagant rewards were given to the founders of some of these houses, and in several cases pensions were awarded to their descendants for two or three generations ; but all the other grants dwindle into insignificance beside those of the Dukedom of Marlborough.

John Churchill, the first duke, was the son of a needy hanger-on at the Court of Charles II., who had impoverished himself by supporting the Royalist cause. John had a sister, Arabella by name, an unattractive girl, who was maid of honour to the Duchess of York. The witty King used to say of his brother James's ugly mistresses that his father confessor must have selected them by way of penance ; so Arabella, the maid of the Duchess, became the mistress of the Duke. Arabella's seduction was the means of John's rapid promotion in the Army ; but if he turned to good account his sister's vices, he made a yet better market of his own. Barbara Palmer, Duchess of Cleveland, whose husband had been created Earl of Castlemaine by Charles II., as the reward of his wife's dishonour, took a violent liking to the handsome young officer. On one occasion the King surprised this pretty pair under very suspicious circumstances ; whereupon Churchill leaped out of the window, for which hazardous feat the Duchess presented him with £5,000. This was by no means the only pecuniary favour Churchill received from Barbara and other ladies of the Court. No wonder that Macaulay speaks of him as a man "who owed his rise to his sister's dishonour, who had been kept by the most profuse, imperious, and shameless of harlots, and whose public

life, to those who can look steadily through the blaze of genius and glory, will appear a prodigy of turpitude." By the time he was thirty-seven years of age Churchill, through the Duke of York's influence, had become a Major-General and a Peer of both England and Scotland, and held several well-paid offices. He crushed the rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth at Sedgemoor; but when he found the tide was turning against James he began to plot against his master. He had not, like Sunderland and other of James's favourites, abjured his Protestantism; but he professed the most devoted loyalty to the King, and publicly vowed that he would spend the last drop of blood in his service. James trusted him implicitly, and promoted him to the office of Lieutenant-General; but all the time Churchill was the very centre of the conspiracy that existed within the Court. He continued his base duplicity to the last. James, having advanced to meet the Prince of Orange, held a council of war, which was protracted to a late hour in the night, Churchill taking an active part therein; before morning the traitor was in the camp of the enemy. The invitation to William was a wise and patriotic step on the part of the Whig nobles, but Churchill's conduct throughout was as treacherous as it was ungrateful. He had his reward. William created him Earl of Marlborough, and entrusted him with a high command. But the new Earl was as false to William as to James. His wife, a proud, ambitious woman, was maid of honour to the Princess Anne, the next heir to the Throne, and in her hands the Princess was a mere tool. It was not enough that Anne had incurred heavy debts to load the Churchills with favours, and that William had employed and trusted Marlborough. The treason against James was followed, in turn, by treason against William, and the discovery of this new treachery resulted in Marlborough's dismissal from office and his temporary confinement in the Tower. It must be remembered, however, that the conduct of the aristocratic statesmen of that time was to the last degree false and treacherous, and that Marlborough was but one among many whose duplicity embittered the life of the brave and resolute champion of the Protestant cause.

At William's death Marlborough rose to the highest pinnacle of power. His wife ruled the Queen while he led the Army. A war with France had broken out just before Anne's accession, and Marlborough commanded the English and Dutch troops with such signal ability that the Queen created him a Duke,

and conferred upon him an annual pension of £5,000 out of the revenues of the Post Office, which the House of Commons, however, refused to settle upon his heirs. The Queen also offered the Duchess £2,000 a year from her privy purse, which was declined at the time ; but nine years after, when the Queen and the Duchess had quarrelled, the latter claimed and received the whole of the arrears. Soon after the Duke won the great victory of Blenheim, the House of Commons, dazzled with the display of military glory, was ready to reward him in a fashion that might even satisfy his own grasping avarice. He was rewarded with the Royal manor and honour of Woodstock and the hundred of Wootton (formerly ancient lands of the Crown), and half a million of money was expended in building him a splendid palace and removing the encumbrances on the estate. The park alone consists of 2,700 acres, and is twelve miles round. After the battle of Ramillies a pension of £4,000 (the original grant was £5,000, according to Coxe) a year was settled upon the Duke's heirs for ever ; and, as it has been paid for 166 years, the gross amount to the present time is £664,000. Is this pension to continue for ever ? It is quite enough that our fathers, or rather the fathers of our aristocracy, should have saddled us with the expenses of their criminal and foolish wars. The faith of the nation was, however, pledged to those who lent the money of which we pay the interest. But the Duke of Marlborough was amply rewarded for his services in his own lifetime ; and even though we admit that Parliament has a moral as well as a legal right to pledge the nation's credit, it does not follow that it has a right to reward generals by taxing posterity.

Marlborough won three or four other great victories, but at last the nation grew weary of the war, and the Queen discarded the Duchess for a new favourite. Loud and deep complaints were made in the House of Commons of Marlborough's greediness and dishonesty. It was alleged by the Commissioners of Public Accounts that the Duke had received in ten years £63,000 from bread-contractors to the Army, and further, that he had received $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the pay of the foreign troops subsidized by England. Against the latter charge he was able to plead a warrant from the Queen in extenuation, but as to the former, even Smollett, who says all he can for the Duke, declares that such practices were mean and mercenary, and greatly tarnished his glory. The House of Commons censured

his conduct, and the Queen directed the Attorney-General to proceed against him, in order to recover some of his ill-gotten gains. At the time when Marlborough was secretly receiving large sums from Army contractors, he and the Duchess held offices and emoluments of the annual value of £64,325. Nor was this all. Besides the Woodstock estates, we are informed by Coxe that the site of Marlborough House, Pall Mall, was granted to the Duchess, and the present mansion was erected thereon at a cost to the nation of £40,000. When the term for which the site had been granted to the Duchess ran out, a succeeding Duke of Marlborough obtained a lease at an annual rental of £27 15s. In 1785 the Duke obtained a new lease of the same property for fifty years for £30 cash down and an annual rental of £75, the annual value of the premises, according to Government returns, being then no less than £600. It is said that before the lease had expired the Marlborough family let this mansion for £3,000 a year.

At the great Duke's death the estates passed in default of male issue to Lord Sunderland, who had married one of his daughters. The Spencer-Churchills are poor, as Dukes go, mainly through the extravagance of some former members of the house, and they have at various times received large out-door relief from the national revenues in addition to the hereditary auxiliary annual pension. One instance must suffice. The Dukes of Marlborough obtained by patent the office of Ranger of Wychwood Forest, in Oxfordshire. When the Land Revenue Commissioners visited the forest at the close of last century, they found that the property had been grossly mismanaged by the Churchills, who were so greatly indebted to the country and the Crown. They discovered that the Duke had made the forest as much as possible his own, that he cut timber, and claimed and used all kinds of rights of which no mention whatever was made in the original grant, and that he had even appropriated to himself, in hard cash, £862 6s. 3d., belonging to the Crown. The mischief was then past mending, for the Commissioners reported, "The greatest part of the timber has been cut at much waste, and there is now very little left." A poor widow who stole a few dead sticks would have been sent to prison, but for a Duke who robbed the nation of timber worth thousands of pounds there was no punishment whatever! Wychwood coppices were granted on a lease to the Churchills from 1762 to 1831, a term of 69 years, for £252 cash down,

and an annual rent of £40. The yearly value was estimated at £256 14s. 6d.—profit on the transaction more than £14,000. Wychwood Forest is now hardly anything more than a name. The property of the Crown in that part of Oxfordshire has dwindled, while the property of the Churchills has increased. The present Duke owns 21,944 acres in Oxfordshire, 2,755 in Bucks, and 1,534 in Wilts. The ducal motto is “Faithful but unfortunate;” looking at the career of the founder of the house, I cannot but think that it would be more truthful to say—“Fortunate but unfaithful.”

VI.

The Howards.



HENRY FitzAlan Howard, Duke of Norfolk, Earl of Arundel, premier Duke and Hereditary Earl Marshal of England, owns 19,217 acres in Sussex, 15,270 in Yorkshire, 4,460 in Norfolk, 4,849 in Surrey, 25 acres in Staffordshire, and 47 in Suffolk. The gross annual rentals are said to be as follows :—

Yorkshire	£231,354
Sussex	29,760
Norfolk	5,095
Surrey	2,887
Suffolk	195
Stafford	74
Total . . .						<hr/> £269,365

The amount set down from Yorkshire is said to be much more than his Grace receives; on the other hand, it must be remembered that much of this property is let on building leases, and though at present the Duke only obtains ground-rents, in process of time the buildings erected will come into the possession of the Howards.

Thomas Howard, who was Duke of Norfolk when the monasteries were suppressed, was one of the greediest of the cormorants in Henry VIII.'s Court. Sir H. Spelman, in his "History of Confiscation," reckons up thirteen religious houses in the Eastern Counties alone upon which the Duke managed to lay his hands; one of these was Castleacre Abbey, which possessed 11 manors and 33 rectories in Norfolk, 8 rectories in other counties, and lands, tithes, and rents in 142 Norfolk parishes. Castleacre was subsequently sold, and the site is now in the possession of the Earl of Leicester. Thetford and other pieces of ecclesiastical plunder have been sold too, and no doubt other estates have been bought with the proceeds. Several of the ancient members of this house lost their heads or were attainted for treason; several of the modern members

appear to have lost their heads in another sense. One modern Duke of Norfolk never washed himself ; but, as he occasionally got helplessly drunk, his servants took advantage of such accidents to wash him. Another Duke, who was living during the Corn Law agitation, distinguished himself by making a speech in which he recommended the poor who had no bread to sustain existence upon hot water with a pinch of curry powder to flavour it. The present Duke is chiefly known to the public by his imposing donations (considering how much ecclesiastical property the Howards hold it would be absurd to call them munificent) to the Roman Catholic Church.

The Duke's Yorkshire estates, situated in and around Sheffield, are the most lucrative. Let us briefly glance at their history. A certain Saxon Earl, Waltheof, was married to Judith, a niece of the Conqueror : but he rebelled, and was killed, and his land in and around Sheffield was given to the said Judith. She appears to have sub-infeuded or granted it for a consideration to Walter de Lovetot, a Norman adventurer. Thence it passed by marriage successively to the Furnivals, the Talbots, and finally to the Howards. The Sheffield estates of the Howards, like their Arundel estates, are thus proved in great part to be spoil of the Norman Conquest. (I use this phrase simply as the shortest way of stating a historical fact.) There is some little obscurity as to the manner in which Walter de Lovetot came into possession, but it is clear he must have obtained a grant from Judith, as one of his descendants acknowledged the King of Scotland, who was descended from Judith, as his superior lord.

In 1815 the Sheffield estates consisted of about twenty thousand acres. As will be seen from the figures given at the commencement of this sketch, that area has since somewhat diminished ; but if the area has diminished, the annual value has immensely increased. Indeed, the very land which has been advantageously sold has been the means of greatly increasing the value of the remainder, for the railways which run through Sheffield pass for a mile each way through the Duke of Norfolk's land. Of course the Duke received ample compensation from the railway companies for the land they required, while they have quadrupled the value of his property. In 1815, according to Hunter's "*History of Hallamshire*," the rental of the Duke of Norfolk's Sheffield estates was £18,000 ; in forty years it had more than doubled. The

revenue drawn from the collieries alone in 1845 was £2,000 a year more than in 1815. In the year 1856 the Duke succeeded to a rent-roll of £36,000 a year from the Sheffield estates, and £80,000 in cash, the proceeds of the sale of lands to railway and other companies. A portion of this property is derived from the plunder of the Church. In ancient times the rectory of Sheffield was very valuable, and of course, its worth has since greatly increased. Some hundreds of years ago it was divided, and two-thirds of the tithes, great and small, were given to the Cistercian Abbey at Coventry. At the suppression of the monasteries the Earl of Shrewsbury obtained a grant of these tithes from the King, and from the Earl of Shrewsbury they ultimately passed by marriage to the Howards. The last Earl of Shrewsbury who held the Sheffield estates left a will by which he ordered that not less than £200 a year should be set aside for maintaining twenty poor persons in Sheffield; but as he left no money, and his lands could not be used for such a purpose, it was something like the Irishman's will, which directed that all his property should go to his brother Mike and the rest to the poor. In 1680 the then Duke of Norfolk, who, by a marriage with a heiress of the Talbots, had become possessed of the property, determined to execute the Earl's wishes, by giving up a small portion of the proceeds of the Sheffield rectory for the purpose of endowing a hospital for twenty poor persons. Another Duke of Norfolk added £1,000 for the same object, and now forty poor persons receive pensions of eight shillings and ten shillings per week, and gifts of coal, shirts, and gowns. Besides these there are some female out-pensioners, who receive 5s. per week. As I am anxious to state all that the Howards have done for Sheffield, so far as I possess information, I may add that they subscribe £30 a year to the Charity School, and that a park of 60 acres has been given by them for public recreation. I find, too, that at the close of last century an infirmary was erected, to which one Sheffielder contributed £596 and another £1,000, while the then Duke of Norfolk munificently exchanged a piece of land so that the infirmary might be built in a better position.

Having seen what the Howards have done for Sheffield, let us consider what Sheffield has done for the Howards. I said that in forty years from 1815 the estate had more than doubled in value. If the increase was in the same proportion prior to

1815, it follows that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, about the time when the land-tax was imposed in lieu of the ancient obligation of the landowners to defend the country, the annual value would be about £2,225. At that time the owner paid four shillings in the pound, or one-fifth of his rent-roll, supposing the valuation was an honest one. The land-tax in Yorkshire is now one penny and one-eighth of a penny in the pound. As it is said that the Duke does not receive nearly so much from Yorkshire as the figures I quoted at the outset, let us take the more moderate estimate which recently went the round of the papers, that his annual income from the Sheffield estates now reaches £100,000. From this it would appear that the land-tax paid by the Duke on those estates is less than £5,000, or rather less than one 200th part of the rental. Of course in a place like Sheffield the owner of land has had little to do except to sign building leases and collect rents, or if he chooses do more he is sure of a splendid return for his outlay. For instance, in 1853 the Duke built a market in Sheffield at a cost of £50,000, which brought him a rental of at least 12½ per cent. A year or two ago the Market was found to be inadequate for the wants of the town, and the Corporation had to spend a few hundred thousands in buying up the Duke's vested interests.


The Honour of Arundel after the Conquest consisted of 57,460 acres, and was granted by William to Roger Montgomery; but on the rebellion of his son the estate was forfeited, and was subsequently granted to another Norman adventurer, William d'Albini, who married the widow of Henry I. Thence a large portion of the property descended by marriage to the FitzAlans, and by marriage again to the Howards. Arundel Castle is for the most part a modern building, the produce of the unearned increment of the Norfolk rentals. In 1783 an Act of Parliament was passed to enable the Duke to grant building or repairing leases on his Strand estate; the names of the streets indicate its position. The amount of the fines received under this Act was £35,308, all unearned increase; of this sum £5,000 was reserved by Parliament for the repairs of Arundel Castle; but probably the fee-simple of the Strand estate would not cover the cost of Arundel, which is one of the most magnificent castles in the kingdom. Arundel is a place "where wealth accumulates and men decay." Sheffield supplies the Howards with such inexhaustible riches that they

are not anxious for Arundel's prosperity. Their policy is rather as leases run out not to renew them, so that they may be troubled by as few poor neighbours as possible. In the Sussex estates of the Howards is included Arundel Priory, suppressed at the Reformation, whose annual value at the present time would be nearly £5,000. The Surrey estates of the Duke, situated in the neighbourhood of Dorking, are, like most of his other property, part of the spoil of the Norman Conquest, derived by marriage from the Earls of Warrenne and Surrey. The Norfolk estates are also for the most part spoil of the Norman Conquest, derived by marriage from the Mowbrays and other families, or from Royal grants. Lest it should be thought that the Howards have absolutely obtained everything for nothing, let me add that three of the manors which they hold in this latter county have been obtained by purchase.

Since the Reformation the Dukes of Norfolk have been usually content to leave the plunder of Crown lands to families of a mushroom growth. They are not, however, above driving a profitable bargain with the Crown at the public expense when the occasion serves. In the last century there was a Duke of Norfolk who obtained a lease of a piece of ground, coach-house, and stables at the West-end, the annual value of which was £60. He paid £30 cash down and a rent of £3 15s. a year, less than one-twelfth of the actual value. And to show that the Government valuation was not at all extravagant, I may add that in 1802 the Duke bought for £1,634 this property for which he had been previously paying an annual rent of seventy-five shillings.

VII.

The Cokes.

HOMAS CARLYLE writes of "The Landed" thus : — " You ask him at the year's end : ' Where is your three hundred thousand pounds ; what have you realised to us with that ? ' He answers in indignant surprise : ' Done with it ? Who are you that ask ? I have eaten it ; I and my flunkies, and parasites, and slaves, two-footed and four-footed, in an ornamental manner ; and I am here alive by it ; *I* am realised by it to you ! ' Alas, is there no noble work for this man, too ? Has he not thick-headed, ignorant boors ; lazy, enslaved farmers ; weedy lands ? Lands ! Has he not weary, heavy-laden ploughers of land ; immortal souls of men, ploughing, ditching, day-drudging, bare of back, empty of stomach, nigh desperate of heart ; and none peaceably to help them but he under heaven ? " Yes, indeed, there is plenty of noble work for this man to do if he will only do it. How much can be done let the history of the Cokes bear witness. I know of no house with a more honourable record.

The Cokes derive the greatness of their house chiefly from Sir Edward Coke, the celebrated Lord Chief Justice, though his father, by the way, was a Norfolk landowner, as well as a bencher of the Temple. Sir Edward himself married a Norfolk heiress, who brought him a large fortune, which he greatly augmented by his professional success. Nearly the whole of the Coke estates were derived by purchase, or through the fortunate marriages of Sir Edward and his son. As Attorney-General, Sir Edward incurred just odium for the harshness with which he conducted the prosecutions of Essex, Southampton, and Raleigh ; but his name will ever be remembered with gratitude by Englishmen for the steadfast courage which he displayed in vindicating the independence of the judicial office against that most contemptible of arbitrary monarchs, James I. Dismissed, but not disgraced, Sir Edward undauntedly defended the privileges of the House of Commons, and was therefore

committed to the Tower. In the early part of the reign of Charles he was one of the most conspicuous of the Parliamentary leaders, but he died at the age of eighty-three, before the great struggle had come to a head. John Coke, the son of Sir Edward, who acquired the Holkham estates partly by marriage and partly by purchase, enclosed from the sea 350 acres of salt marshes. Sir Edward's example as a patriot, and John Coke's example as a reclaimer of land, have not been forgotten by their successors. *Noblesse oblige* has not been with them a mere empty phrase. They have not been unmindful of their own aggrandisement, but the prosperity of the Cokes has not been attained at the expense of the people of West Norfolk; rather should it be said that the people of West Norfolk have always shared therein.

One of the subsequent possessors of the Coke estates was created Earl of Leicester in 1744. He enclosed and embanked 400 acres more at Holkham, which had hitherto been partially covered by the sea, and commenced the erection of the far-famed mansion of Holkham House, which bears the inscription:—"This seat on an open barren estate was planned, planted, built, decorated, and inhabited, in the middle of the 17th Century, by Thos. Coke, Earl of Leicester." The earl died before the mansion was completed, and his only son having preceded him, the title became extinct, and the estates passed into the hands of his nephew, Wenman Roberts, who assumed the name of Coke. His son, Thomas William Coke, succeeded him in 1776.

Mr. Coke, of Holkham, took an active part in both politics and agriculture. For over half a century, with one or two short breaks of a few months each, he represented Norfolk in Parliament. There was no vacillation in his sturdy Liberalism. He voted against the American War; he moved that the independence of the United States should be recognised; he lost his seat in 1784 because he refused to support Pitt, who had hoodwinked the Dissenters by promises which were never kept; he opposed the great war in France; he supported Catholic Emancipation, the Repeal of the Test Act, and the Reform Bill of 1832. If he remained faithful to his convictions it was not for want of temptations to betray them. More than once he was treated with ingratitude by the Norfolk electors, and in 1807 the Tory Duke of Portland informed him that he might have a peerage for the asking. On his final retirement from

the representation of the county, Mr. Coke was entertained at a great public dinner, at which the Duke of Sussex presided. In 1837 he was created Earl of Leicester, and he died in 1842.

But it is as an agriculturist that Coke, of Holkham, is best known. Not far from Holkham House stands a monument, 120 feet in height, erected in his honour, at a cost of £5,000, by nearly a thousand subscribers, the great majority of whom were Norfolk farmers. Nearly half a century before this was erected, the fathers and grandfathers of these farmers presented Mr. Coke with a piece of plate worth £800. What had this man done to be so much beloved and honoured? At the age of twenty-four he came into possession of his estates. Though he owned land in several parishes between Swaffham and Wells, his principal estate was around Holkham. It was little short of a rabbit warren: he himself said that at this time, in the district between Holkham and Lynn, not an ear of corn was to be seen, nor was it believed that one could grow. Earl Spencer, himself a famous agriculturist, writing on Mr. Coke's work in 1842, states that prior to Mr. Coke's coming to Holkham the half-dozen little ports on the north-western coast of Norfolk constantly imported large quantities of wheat; it is stated in *Hamilton's Gazetteer*, published in 1868, that this district now exports 50,000 quarters of wheat annually. The Duke of Sussex, who knew Holkham well, declared that Mr. Coke had raised forests where scarcely a blade of grass grew before. How came it all about? Probably Mr. Coke was not unmindful of the example of those who had preceded him; but the immediate cause of his taking such a deep interest in agriculture appears to have been that, two years after he came into possession, the lease of a large farm at Holkham ran out. The land had been formerly let at 1s. 6d. per acre, and under the expiring lease was let at 3s. Mr. Coke demanded 5s., and on the tenant throwing up the farm he determined to occupy it himself. The whole rental of the estate was but £2,200; forty years after, the annual fall of timber, poles, and underwood alone averaged £2,700, and the total increase of rents exceeded £20,000 per annum, according to Dr. Rigby, who wrote an elaborate account of his visit to the Holkham estates, while the inhabitants of the village itself increased from 162 to 900. As early as 1818 the very land for which Mr. Coke could not obtain a rental of five shillings per acre grew a barley crop double the average of Norfolk barley crops at the time

I have not space to show how all this was brought about, to recount the various agricultural improvements introduced by Mr. Coke, to tell of the commodious farm-houses and cottages which he erected, of his introduction of Southdown sheep and Devon steers into the county, and of the far-famed Holkham sheepshearings, at which, with princely liberality, he entertained annually about three hundred persons for many years in succession. I am content simply to give the results of this man's work, and to add, in the words of one who studied the causes of his success, that the corner stone of his policy was to give his tenants every possible encouragement to improve their farms, by letting the farms on fair and easy terms, with liberal covenants, and at long leases. It is perhaps worthy of notice, too, in days when sport has so largely degenerated into the butchery of tame animals, that Mr. Coke was a keen sportsman all his life, and for a long period, while farming, kept a pack of fox-hounds. It would have hardly been in accordance with the fitness of things if a man, possessing an estate so honestly acquired by his ancestors, and so nobly used by himself, should have left no sons to follow in his footsteps. By his first wife Mr. Coke had only a family of daughters; but at sixty-eight years of age he married a youthful bride, who became the mother of five sons, one of whom is the present Earl of Leicester. Rarely indeed has the country produced a nobler type of "the fine old English gentleman" than the renowned Mr. Coke, of Holkham.

The son appears to have followed in his father's footsteps, for it is recorded that in the year 1857 he reclaimed seven hundred more acres from the sea, for the most part situated in the parish of Holkham. Corn and roots were produced from the very soil which but two years before had been daily covered by the ocean. If I was disposed to be captious, I might dwell upon the story of the Flitcham living, of which the Earl is lay rector, and whose vicar he recently allowed to beg through Norfolk for an increase in the value of his paltry stipend. But the services which the Cokes have rendered to English freedom and to English agriculture are so great, that we may well pass over their failings. The present Earl owns 43,024 acres in Norfolk, with a gross annual rental of £49,009. Should his descendants follow the footsteps of their forefathers by a noble use of power, we may well wish them an unbroken and extended course of prosperity.

VIII.

The Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers.



HE landed possessions of the Duke of Sutherland are as follows:—

Sutherland	1,176,454 acres.
Shropshire	17,495 „
Staffordshire	12,744 „
Yorkshire	1,853 „

The Duchess also owns a small estate, consisting of 149,879 acres, in Ross. We have thus a grand total of one million three hundred and fifty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty-five acres, producing a gross annual rental of £140,928. The Duke is also owner of the following seats:—Dunrobin Castle, Loch Inver House, House of Tongue, Tarbet House, Castle Leod, all in Scotland; and Stafford House, St. James's Park; Trentham Hall, in Staffordshire; Lilleshall Hall, in Shropshire; and Cliefden, in Bucks. It will be obviously impossible to do more than glance at the history of possessions so vast in size and so varied in their origin.

The 1,176,454 acres in Sutherland have been almost entirely acquired by legal robbery, and taken possession of by high-handed cruelty. The Sutherland estate is the largest case of this kind, though in some respects by no means the worst, since several great landowners in the Highlands have depopulated the country to make deer forests, while the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers depopulated it to form sheep farms. The proceedings which I am about to relate were carried out by the grandmother of the present Duke, she having previously married the Marquis of Stafford, the head of the Leveson-Gower family. More or less, she must be held responsible for the policy adopted; but I cannot believe that a woman would deliberately sanction the infamous cruelties by means of which that policy was executed. “Under the old Celtic tenures,” says Sismondi, “the only tenures by which the lords of Sutherland derive their right to the land, the Klean or children of

the soil were the proprietors of the soil. The whole of Sutherland belonged to the men of Sutherland. The chief gave the different tacks of land to his officers, or took them away, according as they showed themselves more or less useful in war. But he could not diminish in the least the property of the Clan itself. Now the Gaelic tenant has never been conquered, nor did he forfeit on any after occasion the right he originally possessed." This view has been fully confirmed by other eminent writers who have studied the question of ancient land tenures. Lord Stanhope says of the Scottish landlords that "they had heritable jurisdiction where their brethren of the South had comfortable rent-rolls; the service of men instead of the payment of money." Mr. Burton, in his "History of Scotland," writing on the state of the Highlands at the beginning of the sixteenth century, says:—"Instead of the land nominally belonging to the head, it belonged, so far as there really was property in it, to the holders and cultivators of it, while their head or chief had concern, not with it, but with them, as living beings over whom he held absolute rule." These Highland clansmen had never been conquered by a foreign foe; if they had no rights in the soil, neither had their chiefs; and yet, by iniquitous legal jugglery, their rights were wrested from them in favour of those chiefs. As Sismondi justly observes, "It is by a cruel abuse of legal forms, it is by an unjust usurpation, that the tacksman and the tenant of Sutherland are considered as having no right to the land which they have occupied for so many ages. A count or earl has no more right to expel from their homes the inhabitants of his county, than a king to expel from their homes the inhabitants of his kingdom."

So much for the question of right; now let us see how the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers treated the people of Sutherland. It was determined to convert the country into sheep farms, and to attain that object the population were to be driven to the seacoast to subsist by fishing. These poor peasant farmers or their fathers had built their own houses, and broken up their little fields from the waste; they were a peaceable, loyal, industrious, and religious people; they had always furnished a large number of men for the wars at the call of their chiefs. And this was how they were treated. The Marchioness took from them their little farms, and left them but 6,000 acres of barren land, which had hitherto produced nothing, and for

1287345

which they had to pay an annual rent of 2s. 6d. per acre. The 794,000 acres were divided into 29 great sheep farms, each inhabited by but one family. The poor people, of course, were reluctant to quit their homes. In March, 1814, the people of two large parishes were summoned to quit in May. Before the day of eviction came the heather was set on fire; many of their cattle were thus starved, and the rest had to be sold at great disadvantage. While many of the men were away selling their cattle, the houses were pulled down over the people's heads, and then set on fire. Many died from fatigue and cold, children were born in the open air on the bare ground, one bed-ridden man had his house unroofed, and died from exposure to the wind and rain; a woman sick in bed had her house fired over her head, and was only rescued when her bed had caught light; one poor fellow, whose family were lying ill of a fever, had to carry his two sick children twenty-five miles on his back before he could find them shelter. An eye-witness of the scene says:—"I ascended a height at about eleven o'clock in the evening, and counted 250 blazing houses." In these two parishes alone no less than 300 houses were fired by the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers. This instance will suffice as a sample. Between 1811 and 1820 no less than 15,000 people were ejected from their homes, and either emigrated to a country unblest by lords, or were driven to the barren sea-coast. The former class were the most fortunate; as for the rest, their misery was extreme. They were located on the coast in order that the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers might draw rents from the sea as well as from the land. Small farmers, hitherto accustomed to keep twenty or thirty breeding cows, were allotted one or two acres each of land so barren that it had never yet produced the Sutherlands a sixpence. They were expected to live mainly by the herring fishery, always a very precarious employment. For some time these poor wretches had to subsist on what shell-fish they could find on the shore; in many cases the cattle broke away from the barren allotments, where there was no herbage, and the moneyless owners had to redeem them with their bed-clothes and wearing-apparel when they were impounded. Some time after, there was great distress in the Highlands, and a national subscription was raised to prevent the people from perishing by sheer starvation; but it was given out that nothing was required in Sutherland—the Duke would take care of that county—so no

relief was sent there. How did the great house behave towards the people whom it had so shamelessly plundered? Let Hugh Miller answer:—"After sufferings most incredible had been endured, and disease and death had been among the wretched people, they received a scanty supply of meal and seed corn, for which, though vaunted at the time as a piece of munificent charity, the greater part of them had afterwards to pay." In order to hide the misery of these people, the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers issued a decree that along the northern coast road, for thirty miles, the inhabitants must either build new houses of stone and mortar or remove. Driven by this order, the men who spent their nights on the sea, fishing, had to spend their days in collecting and carrying stones for the masons; and so poor were these people that they often had to give their last morsel of food to the masons, and go themselves collecting shellfish on the shore to allay the pangs of hunger. When the stone cottages were built, they belonged not to them, but to the Duke.

The conduct of the late Duke of Sutherland at the great disruption of the Church of Scotland, between thirty and forty years ago, shows how dangerous great territorial possessions are to religious liberty. The Duke was not a Presbyterian at all, but nine-tenths of the people in Sutherland had left the Established Church and joined the Free Church, the principal question in the dispute being whether the landlords or the people should nominate the ministers. Notwithstanding that a petition was largely signed by the people, the Duke refused to grant or sell sites for building Free Churches, so that for a long time congregations of six hundred and eight hundred people in the far North of Scotland had to worship in the open air.

I know all that can be said in defence of the Sutherland evictions, that Sutherland now produces more wool and mutton, and, above all, more money for the Sutherland-Leveson-Gowers. I will admit, for the sake of argument, every plea that can be advanced as to the increased productiveness of the county, and then I reiterate that the depopulation of Sutherland was a wanton and inhuman crime, a violation of right and justice, and an indelible blot upon the scutcheon of the ducal house. It is only due to the present Duke to say that he not only bears a good reputation as a landlord, but is placing Scottish agriculturalists under deep obligations by

showing how skill and enterprise can overcome the disadvantages of a barren soil and an ungenial climate.

A large portion of the Shropshire and Staffordshire estates of this family consists of confiscated Church property. James Leveson, one of their ancestors, obtained grants of one monastery in Shropshire and two in Staffordshire. One of these was Lilleshall, the manor and appurtenant estates being valued at the time at £330 annually. Ten thousand pounds a year would by no means represent its real value now, for it is one of the most important and valuable of the Sutherland possessions, containing, as it does, vast seams of coal and lime, which have been worked for many years. The far-famed Trentham is another piece of ancient Ecclesiastical property which has come into the possession of this family. Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, obtained between thirty and forty grants of monastic houses, and one of his female descendants married into this family, Trentham and a few other places being her share of the plunder.

The Sutherland evictions have had their counterpart in other parts of the Highlands, the people being expelled to make room for the deer. On this subject Sismondi well says :—
“What will become of the State if the proprietor of a province imagines that his interest is in opposition to that of its inhabitants, and that it suits him to replace men with sheep and cattle? It was not for this end that territorial property was established, or was guaranteed by the laws. Nations acknowledged it in the persuasion that it would be useful to those who had nothing, as well as to those who had something; but Society is shaken when the rights of property are put into opposition to national right.”

IX.

The Cecils.

(EXETER BRANCH.)



WHEN the juvenile member for North Northamptonshire announced in his address to the electors that he was a Conservative by *birth* and conviction, the statement was received with much derision. For my part, I am not at all surprised at Lord Burghley's declaration. Is he not heir to 27,684 acres—13,545 in Northamptonshire, 10,712 in Rutland, and 3,427 in Lincoln—producing a gross rental of £48,663? To regard this lordly domain as intended by Divine and human law for his sole use and benefit, irrespective of the want of farmers, labourers, and food-eaters, no doubt comes natural to Lord Burghley. I can quite understand his Conservatism; it is the subservient, ignorant, and stupid Conservatism of the people who vote for him that fills me with amazement. Let us see whence these twenty-seven thousand six hundred and eighty-four broad acres came.

It is necessary for us, first of all, to go back to David Cecil, grandfather of the celebrated Lord Burghley. This David, who in the latter part of his life had some relations with the Court of Henry VIII., obtained from that Monarch the offices of Water Bailiff of Whittlesea Mere and Keeper of Cliff Park, in Northamptonshire. His son Richard, who, in addition to his father's old offices, held that of Groom of the Robes, obtained large grants of land in Northamptonshire, Rutland, Lincoln, and Kent. Of Richard's son, William, afterwards Lord Burghley, and the grants obtained by him, I shall have something to say when dealing with the Salisbury branch of the house. At Lord Burghley's death the greater part of his estates were inherited by his eldest son, who was created Earl of Exeter, and from whom the present Marquis is descended. These estates are mostly situated in the vicinity of Burghley House, near Stamford, which is close to the three counties of Lincoln Rutland, and Northampton. The great mansion,

Burghley House, was erected by Lord Burghley. It has a very spacious park, and among other objects of interest may be mentioned the state bed of the Marquis. The bed itself is six feet high, the canopy eighteen feet, and the total cost of this sumptuous piece of furniture was £3,000.

Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and eighty-four acres seems a somewhat large estate to be acquired by a branch of one family in 350 years, especially as that family has not been connected with commerce or manufactures. How have these enormous possessions been acquired? Let us take first the county of Rutland, in which the Marquis owns 10,712 acres. With the help of Blore's "*History of Rutland*," which deals with only a portion of the county, most of these acres can be accounted for. The manor of Tinwell, containing 1,535 acres, now in the possession of the Marquis of Exeter, was granted to Richard Cecil by Edward VI., the King being a boy, and his Secretary of State being Richard Cecil's son. The manor of Essendine, containing 1,457 acres, was granted to the same ancestor by the same monarch. At Ryhall, the Marquis of Exeter, who is lord of the manor, owns 1,040 acres; most of this property was purchased by Lord Burghley of its previous owner, but 273 acres of it were obtained under an award of an Inclosure Act, in compensation for the rectorial tithes. At Casterton Magna the Marquis owns 2,150 acres, the manor having been granted by Queen Elizabeth to Lord Burghley's eldest son, Lord Burghley at the time being her chief adviser. At Pickworth the Marquis of Exeter has 2,255 acres under a similar grant made by Queen Elizabeth to the same ancestor. I have thus accounted for nearly 8,500 acres, out of the 10,712 held by the Marquis of Exeter in Rutland, of which 8,500 only 767 are obtained by purchase. I have no doubt that this small number would be more than counterbalanced by the number of acres obtained by the Exeter Branch of the Cecils under Inclosure Acts, for Rutland is a county where this legal method of robbing the poor has been largely in vogue.

Let us turn from Rutland to Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire. The Marquis owns considerable property at Stamford. Whence did he derive it? At the dissolution of the monasteries there was a certain Priory of St. Michael in Stamford, the site of which, with the lands thereto belonging, amounting to 530 acres, was granted to David Cecil, subject to a rent-charge. Soon after, his grandson, William, became Secretary of State.

and the rent-charge was remitted. How we despise French and American statesmen for feathering their own nests, forgetting that it was by just such means that the proudest houses in England became great. The Marquis owns Cliff Park in Northamptonshire. Whence was this derived? From the same David Cecil, who obtained a grant of its Keepership for himself and his son. The son's son was Queen Elizabeth's favourite Minister, and in his time the place was disparked, and so the whole 1,704 acres came into the absolute possession of the Cecils. The Marquis is the lay rector of Stamford. How did he derive that? It was given to his ancestor, Richard Cecil, in the 33rd year of Henry VIII. The Marquis owns the manor, rectory, and advowson of Worthop, part of the ancient possessions of Stamford Priory, with sundry other lands and messuages there, formerly belonging to Crowland Abbey. These, again, were granted to the same fortunate Richard Cecil, in the 32nd year of Henry VIII. The Marquis owns the manors of Achurch and Thorpe Watervill, with the advowson; these were granted to William Cecil in the fifth year of Edward VI., the said William being then Secretary of State. A little later, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, Southorp was given to William Cecil's eldest son. The Cecils did certainly purchase Barnach and Pilsgate, but that is balanced by the sale of Maxey to the Fitzwilliams, a piece of Church property which the Cecils obtained for the asking. Burghley itself, I believe, came into the possession of the Cecils by the marriage of William Cecil with the heiress of the property. Here as elsewhere the reader must excuse the bald statement of facts, as I am anxious to compress as many details as possible into a reasonable compass. Some who, like Dean Stanley, are curious in regard to street nomenclature, may perhaps ask whether Burghley and Exeter streets, in the Strand, have any connection with this house. The plot of ground enclosed by them and by a portion of the Strand was originally Church property, which was granted to Sir Thomas Palmer, a creature of the Protector Somerset. On his attainder, in the reign of Mary, it reverted to the Crown, and was let for forty shillings a year. Queen Elizabeth granted the land to Lord Burghley, who built a splendid mansion thereon.

At various periods the Exeter Cecils have continued to add to their wealth and increase the area of their domains by profit-

able transactions in connection with the great ancient Royal forest of Rockingham, which was contiguous to their Northamptonshire property. Soon after the death of Lord Burghley, his son, the Earl of Exeter, obtained a grant for three lives of the office of Master Forester—a grant which was almost equivalent to the lease of a fine estate. After that lease had run out the Exeter Cecils had to be content with one portion of the forest—Westhay Woods. Not very many years ago the Marquis gave £1,556 4s. 2d. for the remainder of the Crown rights therein, thus increasing the area of his Northamptonshire property at a very small cost to himself. I find also that in 1781 the then Earl of Exeter (the Marquisate was not created till 1801) obtained from the Crown a lease of the manor of Kingscliffe in Northamptonshire, with the lands thereto belonging, for thirty-one years, for £54 cash down and an annual rent of £62 2s., although the annual value of the property according to a Government return was £91 14s. 2d. This property was subsequently purchased of the Crown by the Exeter Cecils for £3,000, when public attention had been attracted to the scandalous mismanagement of Crown lands, so that it is evident that the estimated value was not at all an extravagant one. It is clear that the Exeter Cecils have either begged or taken from the Crown, or wrested from the people by means of Enclosure Acts, by far the greater proportion of their landed property.

In the good old times to which Mr. Lowe looks back so regretfully, when a few great landowners returned whom they pleased for half the boroughs in England, the Marquis of Exeter used to have two representatives in the House of Commons, who nominally sat for Stamford. Attempts were made to return independent men, whereupon the Marquis flooded the little town with bullies and prizefighters, brought from London and elsewhere, and, when the election of 1831 was over, his Lordship not only turned out his tenants who did not vote according to his dictation, but threatened to eject all his tenants who were widows, unless they married again, and thus furnished him with additional voting machines in future. Stamford, or rather the Marquis of Exeter, only returns one member now, and this creature of a creature of the Crown is able to neutralise the voice of the 9,603 electors of Dewsbury, or the 10,700 electors of Middlesbrough, or the 11,267 electors of Gateshead, or the 12,731 electors of Hudders-

field. The pitiable subjection of the Northampton farmers to Burghley House was lately shown by the return of a young Cecil, whose ignorance of politics was such that Conservatives were ashamed to boast of such a victory; but North Northamptonshire, at any rate, has 5,000 electors. Why the Marquis should continue to send a member to the House of Commons, in the name of but 1,200 people in Stamford, is a question which will have to be answered ere long.

The Fanes.

LORD WESTMORLAND, by the side of such Peers as the Duke of Sutherland or the Marquis of Exeter, is a minnow among the tritons, but the Fanes will serve to illustrate one of the darkest periods of English History—the reign of Edward VI. The den of thieves which formed the Council of the boy-King exhibited an amount of selfish rapacity that is almost incredible. Mr. Froude writes thus:—"After liberal deductions on all grounds, after reasonable allowances for grants legitimately made as rewards for services, there will remain, on a computation most favourable to the Council, estates worth half a million—in the modern currency about five millions—which the Ministers with their friends had appropriated—I suppose I must not say stolen—and divided among themselves. In the different lists the names of the Council nowhere appear as purchasers. They exchanged occasionally, being nearest to the fountain, and having the privilege of the first draught; but in general when any Minister of the Crown is mentioned it is as an object of unmixed liberality. The literal entries are an imperfect guide, since it appeared in the inquiries that followed the deposition of Somerset from the Protectorate that conveyances had been made out in other names to cover the extent of the appropriations."

The Earl of Westmorland, who resides at Apthorpe House, Northamptonshire, owns 5,973 acres of land in that county. With the exception of one Fane, who was a lieutenant of the Duke of Marlborough, the history of this undistinguished house presents nothing remarkable. The Fanes are altogether creatures of the Crown; the very timber used in building their house was obtained without payment from the Royal Forest. The Fanes originally came from Kent, the first of the race of whom anything is certainly known having obtained from the King a grant of the Manor of Hadloe. One of his descendants was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, and married a daughter of

the ancient house of Nevill. His son married the granddaughter of Sir Walter Mildmay, from whom were derived the estates in Northamptonshire.

Walter Mildmay held an office under Henry VIII. in the Court of Augmentations, which had charge of the estates of the suppressed monasteries; during the reign of Edward VI. he was Warden of the Mint; and in the time of Elizabeth he became Chancellor of the Exchequer. Besides the ordinary emoluments accruing to office, the Mildmays managed to obtain considerable royal grants. Thomas Mildmay received the sites of two abbeys in Norfolk; Walter, as we are informed in Tanner's "Notitia," had a half-share in an abbey which possessed property equivalent to £10,000 a year at the present time. Besides this, Sir Walter Mildmay contrived to obtain other liberal grants of lands, as we shall presently see. Sir Walter was succeeded by his son Sir Anthony, whose only daughter and heiress married one of the Fanes. The wealth she brought him, in addition to the estates, enabled him to purchase a peerage. James I. and his favourites did a roaring trade in peerages and baronetcies, so Fane became first Baron Burghersh, and soon after Earl of Westmorland.

Let us begin with Apthorpe Manor, the seat of the Fanes. Walter Mildmay obtained the Manor and Park of Apthorpe, in the reign of the boy-King Edward VI., in exchange for other lands. Such bargains as these between the Crown and the courtiers it need hardly be said were always greatly to the disadvantage of the former and the advantage of the latter. Yarwell was granted to the Earl of Westmorland's fortunate ancestor, Sir Walter Mildmay, in the reign of Edward VI., so also was Wood Newton, so also was Tansor. "Woe to thee, O land, when thy King is a child," and cannot take care of his own. However, in the reign of Philip and Mary these grants were confirmed with the liberties belonging to the said manors. The manor of Nassington was honestly bought for £450.

In the vicinity of Apthorpe House was the ancient royal forest of Rockingham. "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." Where a Royal forest was, there are sure to be found striking instances of aristocratic rapacity, fraud, and unfaithfulness. In the 13th year of Elizabeth, certain lands, woods, and coppices within the precincts of Sulehay farms and Shortwood, part of Rockingham forest,

were granted to Sir Walter Mildmay, Elizabeth's Chancellor of the Exchequer, under certain conditions. In the reign of Charles I., the Earl of Westmorland obtained a lease for three lives of the Bailiwick of Cliffe, 3,031 acres in extent, the largest of the three portions into which the Forest of Rockingham was divided. The arrangement made was that the Crown should cease to pay the Earl of Westmorland for taking care of the woods, in consideration of which the Earl was to have possession of the woods themselves, the King only taking a few deer when he wanted them. Yet, though the Fanes had the use of this estate from the Crown for a long period, the Earl of Westmorland, at the commencement of last century, had the audacious effrontery to present a petition for compensation for feeding the deer in the woods, and he obtained a grant of nearly four hundred acres of pasture land in consequence. To show that I have not in any way exaggerated the facts, I quote the following extract from the Report of the Land Revenue Commissioners upon this transaction, presented to the House of Commons in 1796. They say, after stating the facts of the case:—"On a review of this proceeding, the circumstances attending it cannot but appear extraordinary. The Earl of Westmorland represented to the Crown that the charge of paying keepers and other expenses concerning the forest had been a great burden on him and his family, and that they had a right to be reimbursed, though the offices were granted to his ancestors on the express condition of paying the keepers, and were accompanied by grants of woods and lands of very great value." And so "the valuable lawns of Moorhay and Sulehay, containing nearly four hundred acres of pasture land, and reserved for the feeding of the King's deer, became discharged of that incumbrance, and the full and undivided possession of them was transferred to the grantee for less than a farthing an acre per annum." Thus for nearly a hundred years had the Fanes been paying the paltry sum of £7 9s. 3d. a-year rent for property valued at the close of the term at nearly £1,000 per annum, exclusive of the lodges and timber. Then it was arranged that the Earl should buy the property outright. In 1783 it was declared to be worth, inclusive of the timber, no less than £50,000; the Earl was allowed to purchase it for £10,038 15s. 6d., payable in thirteen years. True, the Earl was charged 5 per cent. on the purchase-money, but during the thirteen years he was receiving 10 per

cent. from the tenants, to say nothing of the money raised by the sale of the timber. This was not the only transaction in Crown lands by which the Fanes made large profits. At the commencement of the present century I find that they held a lease of certain coal-mines in Yorkshire, belonging to the Crown, for which they paid an annual rental of ten shillings and one-tenth of the profits.

The landed estates of the Fanes are not large compared with those of some of the great houses; but then it did not cost them much for house-rent. One of the family had a lease of a house close to St. James's-park, from 1765 to 1814, for £40 cash down and an annual rental of six shillings and eight-pence, the value of the house being £112 a year. Another had a fifty years' lease of a house belonging to the Crown for £45 cash down and £5 a year rent, the annual value of the house being £118.

The possessions of the Fanes being comparatively small, most of them have had to live out of the taxation of the country. The Army, the Navy, the Church, and the Civil Service have generally been well provided with Fanes. One Earl of Westmorland, who had previously been Master of the Buckhounds, was appointed to the sinecure office of Lord Privy Seal in 1800, and, save for two years, held it till 1827. His eldest son was Envoy at a paltry Italian Court, at an annual salary of £3,900. This nobleman had more than a dozen relatives, sons, grandsons, nephews, and cousins, who held offices in the Army, to say nothing of the Navy and the Church. Thanks to Mr. Gladstone's Administration, it is almost impossible that this should occur again.

The Pelham-Clintons.

LOYALTÉ N'A HONTE—"Loyalty has no shame," is the proud motto of this family. I believe their motto is a most truthful one. Common people who are dragged into bankruptcy, divorce, and criminal courts usually hide their diminished heads; but *loyaulté n'a honte*. I am not surprised at this. I have read something of the little peccadilloes of the members of this illustrious house—how one of them was a plunderer of Church lands on an immense scale, how another contrived to get hold of part of the Royal Forest of Sherwood, how another was the greatest adept in the arts of political jobbery and corruption that England has ever seen, how another leased the Royal Manor of Newark for a nominal sum and regarded the very souls of the tenants as included in the bargain, how another and another failed to pay his debts, how another appeared in a great divorce case. But what are all these little eccentricities? Are not the great families of Clinton, Holles, Pelham, Cavendish, Gresham, and Harley the confluent streams that unite to form this illustrious line? Let us speak with bated breath and whispering humbleness. Is not the Duke of Newcastle the nominal owner, at any rate, of 34,467 acres of land in Nottinghamshire, with a rent-roll of £73,098? Did not a Duke of Newcastle, notwithstanding these great possessions, accomplish the superhuman task of becoming insolvent? Not that he was sold up, like any common bankrupt—debts may come and debts may go, but Dukes go on for ever!

An anonymous critic complains that I deal with the worst periods of English history; but it so happens that there is scarcely a reign of any length, from the time of Henry VIII. to that of George IV., to which I have not already had occasion to allude. The Pelham-Clintons, for instance, will bear looking at all through that long period of 350 years. Hitherto I have for the most part contented myself with a bare recital of facts; I fear I have not sufficiently expressed my admiration for the

great aristocratic virtue of acquisitiveness. Let the Tweeds and Sweeneys, the De Mornys and De Persignys, of coming times look to English history for precedents—assuredly they will find them in abundance.

Let them take the ancestors of the Pelham-Clintons for example. There was one, Lord Edward Clinton, a naval officer in the reign of Henry VIII. I am lost in admiration at this man's stupendous achievements, not on the sea, but on the land. He obtained from Henry half-a-dozen of the despoiled monasteries; but when the boy Edward came to the throne he managed to get hold of eleven more, some of them, such as Crowland and Barking, being immensely rich. The total value of these lavish grants at the present time would be not far from £100,000 a year. He lived on to the reign of Elizabeth, when he was created an Earl. There is still a Lord Clinton, who probably holds some of those extensive grants; but most of them have, doubtless, been sold, or have passed by marriage into other families. None of them, so far as I have been able to ascertain, are now in the possession of the Pelham-Clintons, who, indeed, seem to have a knack of easily acquiring property, and of letting it slip through their fingers with equal facility.

Another ancestor to whom the Pelham-Clintons are more indebted was William Cavendish, who was one of Henry's Commissioners at the suppression of the monasteries, and subsequently Treasurer of the Chamber to that King and to his successors, Edward VI. and Mary. This man also obtained enormous grants of land, chiefly in the reign of Edward. A portion of his property, however, was brought into the family by his marriage with a crafty Derbyshire widow well known as Bess of Hardwicke. Their son, the Lord Newcastle who was defeated by Cromwell at Marston Moor, was estimated by his lady to have spent nearly three-quarters of a million in fighting for the absolute despotism which Charles I. sought to impose upon the English people. His son left five daughters his co-heirs, one of whom married John Holles, whose grandson was created Duke of Newcastle. This Duke had no children, and subsequently his nephew, Thomas Pelham, became Duke, whose niece married Henry Clinton, Earl of Lincoln, from whom the present Duke of Newcastle is descended. It is said that the first Holles who was ennobled paid £15,000 for his peerage to the Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of James I.

The greater part of the Nottinghamshire estates were derived from the Holles Duke of Newcastle above mentioned, who in turn had derived them from the Cavendishes. Part of his property was brought into the Bentinck family by his granddaughter; the remainder went to the Pelhams. Nottingham Park, a portion of old Sherwood Forest, had been bought by him of the Earl of Rutland, to whom it had been granted of the Crown for an annual payment of £10 10s. per annum. I wish it were possible to learn the exact amount of the unearned increase of the rent of this ancient Royal domain up to the present time.

The great tract of country formerly known as Sherwood Forest has been gradually encroached upon by neighbouring landowners, and is now owned chiefly by the Dukes of Portland and Newcastle. This forest as late as the reign of Henry VIII. consisted of no less than 95,000 acres. To encroach on the lands of the Crown has generally been regarded by aristocratic statesmen as a legitimate mode of adding to their possessions. Why should they think otherwise? "Loyalty has no shame." One little instance must here suffice. In the year 1709 a broad riding was cut through Sherwood Forest for the Duke of Newcastle's convenience. The cost of this, £118, was charged to the Crown, but the timber which was felled, and which was worth no less than £1,500, was given to the Duke.

Thomas Pelham, Duke of Newcastle, was perhaps one of the worst and most incapable statesmen that ever ruled England, Horace Walpole says that he was so ignorant that he believed Jamaica was in the Mediterranean. For twenty-four years he was a Minister for the Colonies, and did not a little to bring about the disruption with America. Mr. J. R. Green says: "He knew better than any living man the price of every member, and the intrigues of every borough. What he cared for was, not the control of affairs, but the distribution of patronage and the work of corruption." The best that can be said about him is, that he was not personally avaricious, though the following facts make this somewhat doubtful. I find that the Pelham-Clintons made some very comfortable little bargains in Crown Lands. In 1770 this Duke of Newcastle obtained a lease of the Manor of Newark, in Nottinghamshire, for which he paid £200 cash down in addition to an annual rent of £144. The estimated value according to a Government return in 1790 was £482, but there can be very little doubt that the

actual value was at least three times that sum, for after a small portion of it had been sold the remainder of this very same property was estimated by Government officials in 1830 at an annual value of £2,292, and that this estimate was by no means an extravagant one may be gathered from the fact that the then Duke of Newcastle was paying on a new lease granted in 1806 an annual rental of £2,016. In point of fact the new lease was almost as scandalous a transaction as the old one, for the property consisted of 950 acres mostly covered with dwellings, tolls of bridges, fisheries, and markets, yielding to the lessee £4,000 a year, and capable of yielding £7,000 if it had not been to a great extent let with a view to electioneering purposes. Prior to the Reform Bill of 1832, of which he was a bitter opponent, the Duke returned six members of Parliament. In 1830 he not only ejected his tenants who voted contrary to his orders, but even turned out a tenant who dared to be shaved by a barber that voted against the Newcastle nominee. He was so unpopular that he fortified his house with cannon, and kept a strong guard constantly on duty. This was the nobleman who, when denounced for electoral coercion, asked the memorable question, "Cannot I do what I will with my own?"

In the year 1773 a lease was granted to the Duke of Newcastle, to expire in 1823, of the manor of Byfleet and Weybridge, with Byfleet or Weybridge-park, including a capital mansion, two other houses, two mills, and other buildings. The annual value of this property, no doubt under-estimated, was £571 12s., and the Duke had only to pay £1,800 cash down, and an annual rent of £18 till the year 1810, to be increased to £30 from thence to the remainder of the term. The same Duke also had a lease of Oatlands Farm, near Weybridge, from 1754 to 1784. The annual value was £150; the Duke only paid £400 cash down and an annual rent of £14 3s. 3d. The successor of the same Duke obtained a lease of certain extra-parochial tithes in various counties. All that he had to pay the Crown was one-third of its profits—the profits, not the receipts—amounting to £83, so that he must have put into his own pocket during the whole term of the lease £166 a year net. A female member of this lucky family had a fifty years' lease of a mansion at Whitehall, for which she paid only a third of its annual value, not even the usual small fine being exacted for the accommodation. Another Pelham had a man-

sion at Westminster on exactly similar terms. Omitting all mention of great offices of State which have been held at various times by members of this family, I find that early in the present century a dowager Duchess had an annual pension of £1,000 ; another Pelham-Clinton had a pension of £780, besides several colonelcies held by cadets of the house at salaries of £1,000 and £1,200. Were I a chronicler of scandal I could adduce some curious illustrations of the motto of the house, but such matters are outside my province. One wrong can never justify another, but when Tory journalists, with eager avidity, hold up to reprobation some American politician who has betrayed his trust, it would be well for them to remember that jobbery is not the peculiar vice of Republican statesmen, as the history of such houses as that of the Pelham-Clintons amply demonstrates.

The Pigbys.



THE English are essentially a religious people. Hence it is that the personal piety of some of the worst of our kings has always, in the eyes of many, appeared to more than half atone for their public misdeeds. Hence it is that we, who are proud of our Protestantism, are accustomed to look at the Reformation almost exclusively from its theological side, ignoring its social and political aspects. Another popular blunder is the supposition that all the ecclesiastical property now in the hands of the great families was derived from the suppression of the monastic houses. This is by no means the case. Even in the reign of Edward, the abbey lands failed to satisfy the greed of those in power. As Mr. J. R. Green tells us, even "the plunder of the chauntries and guilds failed to glut the appetite of the crew of spoilers. Half the lands of every See were flung to them in vain. The See of Durham had been wholly suppressed to satisfy their greed; and the whole endowments of the Church were threatened with confiscation." Mary did something to reverse this, but there has been nothing reversed in that direction since the days of Elizabeth, and it would not be going too far to say that if succeeding Sovereigns had dealt with the Protestant Church of England in the same manner as the Virgin Queen, that Church would long since have been disendowed piecemeal. The great houses of 300 years ago did not look upon disendowment with the determined hostility exhibited by the great houses of the present time; but at the present time no one proposes to disendow the Church in the interest of servile courtiers and *parvenu* nobles. Let me quote Mr. Green once more. Speaking of Queen Elizabeth, he says, "She carved out rewards for her Ministers from the Church lands with a queenly disregard of the rights of property. Lord Burghley built up the estate of the house of Cecil out of the demesnes of the See of Peterborough. The neighbourhood of Hatton-garden to Ely-place recalls the spoliation of another

bishopric in favour of the Queen's sprightly Chancellor." How this was accomplished let Dr. Hook, the author of the "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," inform us. He says: "The Reformation gave a great amount of power to the Queen over the Church lands. During the vacancy of any preferment she claimed a right to appropriate the income to her own purposes." This was bad enough, but for such practices Elizabeth could at least find plenty of precedents. But Dr. Hook adds—"She forced the clergy to exchange their lands with the Crown, being certain in every exchange to make the best of the bargain. Out of this property the Earl of Leicester manœuvred to obtain considerable grants, and the clergy too often connived at this robbery and wrong, themselves receiving a compensation, inadequate so far as the Church was concerned, but at the same time sufficient to offer a temptation to individuals." Archbishop Whitgift, who on his appointment to the See of Worcester, had succeeded in getting back into the possession of that bishopric a thousand acres of land of which it had been unjustly deprived, on his promotion to Canterbury addressed to the Queen a respectful but bold remonstrance, which had the effect of stopping, or, at all events, of checking, these nefarious proceedings, but not until a great amount of Church property had already been alienated. As the lands now held by the Digbys in Dorsetshire for the most part were ecclesiastical estates alienated in Queen Elizabeth's reign, the story of this house will furnish us with a fair sample of modern disendowments. The Church property of the Russells, Cavendishes, Petres, and Howards was, so long as it was in ecclesiastical hands, devoted to what most Englishmen regard as superstitious uses; the alienations of Elizabeth were from the property of the Protestant Church of England.

The Digbys, indeed, did not obtain their lands directly from the Church; they simply spoiled the spoiler, but it must be added that they laid hold of not only that which the spoiler obtained for nothing, but also of that which he obtained by fair purchase. In the early part of the reign of James I., Sir Walter Raleigh was possessed of the Hundreds of Sherborne and Yetminster, the manors of Sherborne, Burton, Pinfold, and Rimesly, and lands in several contiguous places. Most of this property had been ecclesiastical—ancient monastic lands, which had been annexed to the Bishopric of Salisbury.

Elizabeth rewarded her favourites with the spoil of the Church, and kept Bishoprics and Deaneries vacant till clergymen could be found base enough to accept them on condition of alienating some of their most valuable possessions to some courtier. Twice was the See of Salisbury kept vacant in this manner. Bishop Coldwell granted the Sherborne estates to the Queen for ninety-nine years for a small annual rent, and the Queen conveyed them to Sir Walter Raleigh. At the next vacancy Dr. Matthews refused the bishopric on the conditions proposed, but Dr. Cotton was more compliant, and on his acceptance of the See, Raleigh surrendered his former leases, the estates were granted in fee to the Queen, for a payment of £320 a year, the Queen re-granted them to Raleigh, and thus these great possessions were totally alienated from the Church. Raleigh subsequently bought other lands in the neighbourhood. When Raleigh was unrighteously condemned, all his lands were, of course, confiscated; and James II. granted them to his favourite, Carr, who, not long after, forfeited them when convicted of being an accessory to Sir Thomas Overbury's murder. The lands were then granted by James to Sir John Digby. On the accession of Charles I., Carew Raleigh, son of Sir Walter, petitioned to be restored in blood and estate, but Charles admitted that when he was Prince of Wales, Digby had bribed him with £10,000 not to restore to the Raleighs their property, so Carew Raleigh had to be content to be restored in blood, and to receive a payment during his lifetime of £400 a-year from Digby.

There are two branches of the family. Mr. G. D. W. Digby is the present possessor of the lands formerly belonging to the Bishopric of Salisbury. He owns 21,451 acres in Dorset, and 5,710 in Somerset, with a rent-roll of £41,228. Lord Digby owns in—

Dorsetshire	1,886 acres.
Warwickshire	124 "
King's County	30,627 "
Queen's County	938 "

the gross annual rent of the whole being £16,472.

The Digbys owed their rise originally to Royal grants of land. During the Wars of the Roses the family was Yorkist; but when Richmond, afterwards Henry VII., appeared in arms against Richard III., the Digbys enrolled themselves under his banner, and contributed to the victory of Bosworth

Field. For this service Henry rewarded Sir Simon Digby with large grants of land and with lucrative public employments. Some time after, Perkin Warbeck, an imposter, who gave himself out to be the Duke of York, raised a revolt, and succeeded in deceiving many Yorkists. Among these was Sir Simon Mountford, of Coleshill, in Warwickshire, who sent Warbeck a sum of money. For this offence he was convicted, and executed at Tyburn, and his confiscated lands were given by the King to Sir Simon Digby. From another of the numerous branches of the family came Sir Everard Digby, one of the conspirators engaged in the Gunpowder Plot.

In the reign of Elizabeth Robert Digby went over to Ireland, where he settled, and was knighted by the Earl of Essex. Some little time after he appears as an Irish member of Parliament. He was fortunate enough to marry a rich heiress, Lettice, granddaughter of the eleventh Earl of Kildare. The Fitzgeralds, a family which is now represented by the Duke of Leinster, owed the earldom of Kildare, with its extensive possessions, to a Norman ancestor, who went over with Strongbow in the time of Henry II., and gained a considerable footing in Ireland, though the country was only nominally conquered. By the right of the sword the Norman adventurers won and held the Irish lands, which have since descended to their posterity. Lettice Fitzgerald, daughter of Lord Offaley, and granddaughter of the Earl of Kildare, brought into the Digby family at her marriage the barony of Geashill and other extensive landed possessions in King's County.

My anonymous critic, who complained that I selected "the worst periods of English history," will hardly be disposed to include "the spacious times of great Elizabeth" in that designation. Yet it was in that golden age of our history that the broad acres now owned by the Digbys in Dorsetshire were unrighteously alienated, not from communities of idle and dissolute monks, but from the Protestant Church of England.

The Manners Family.

(RUTLAND LINE.)



HERE was a time, though it is now many years since, when the aristocratic statesman whose time is divided between lauding the Turks and issuing prosaic regulations as to postcards and newspaper wrappers, burst into song, and gave utterance to that renowned, but oft-misquoted, couplet—

“Let wealth and commerce, laws and learning die,
But leave us still our old nobility.”

Lord John Manners, I believe, in riper years, very sensibly spoke of his poem as the hasty effusion of inconsiderate youth, but he only wrote what not a few people still think. Born of such a distinguished house, it is not surprising that he should have regarded “our old nobility” as of more importance than laws or learning, wealth or commerce. We must concede there is something very imposing in the Dukedom of Rutland. The “lordly terraces” of Belvoir; the glamour of romance that has encircled Haddon Hall; the former connection of the family with one of the most ancient baronies in England; the matrimonial alliances with Vernons, Sydneys, Cecils, Montagus, Russells, and Seymours; the newer peerages of Canterbury and Manners obtained by offshoots of the house; above all, the sixty-nine thousand broad acres, distributed over seven different counties, and the vast rent-roll of nearly £90,000, are calculated to excite the admiring wonder of all who habitually reverence big things. But, after all, the Manners, as a great family, are younger than the Corporation of London, younger than the printing press, younger than the dawn of the Reformation.

The family of Manners was of some note indeed in Northumberland in ancient times, some of its members serving the office of Sheriff therein; and towards the close of the reign of Henry VI., Sir Robert Manners married an heiress, who brought

the barony of Ros into the family for a time. The real founder of the greatness of the house, however, was Thomas Manners, created Earl of Rutland by Henry VIII., who was one of that monarch's "courtiers' greedy herd," and whose appropriations of Church property stamped his shame upon the great house. For the words I use I have the authority of one of his own descendants. It was no less a person than Lord John Manners who wrote :—

“— statesmen deem they may with safety spoil
Those courts that prove their fathers' holier toil ;
While sacrilege their path to future fame,
They glory in the deeds that stamp their shame.
Are not we now still suffering from the sin
Of him who brought dread confiscation in ?
And durst, by God's sure vengeance undeterred,
To lavish on his courtiers' greedy herd,
The wealth which ages had in meekness given
To deck the forehead of the bride of Heaven ?”

Of all Henry's courtiers there were hardly any so greedy as Thomas Manners, who obtained immense grants of monastic property from the Crown. The detailed account of the lands possessed by him which is given in his will would of itself take up nearly the whole of the space occupied by this article. Nearly all these lands were formerly Church property. Whatever the Manners family has since derived, by purchase or inheritance from other houses, is outweighed by the ecclesiastical lands which they have at various times sold, and by the common lands which they have enclosed.

As the Duke of Rutland holds more property in Leicestershire than in any other county, I shall confine myself mostly to the Leicestershire estates. As to Belvoir, a portion of it is derived by marriage with the heiress of an ancient family to whom one of our Norman kings had granted it ; but Belvoir itself had a priory which possessed lands in six parishes, whose present annual value would be nearly £4,000. The Earl of Rutland and another person obtained a grant of this property between them. This, however, was but a small thing. The Earl obtained a grant of the estates of Croxton Abbey, consisting of lands in nearly fifty parishes, for an annual fixed rent of £297 9s. 4½d. The sum is so small now as to be scarce worth notice, but it would be interesting to learn whether that rent is paid still, and if not, at what period the payment ceased.

Again, I find that for the payment of £2,356 the Earl

obtained a grant of the house and site of the lately-dissolved monastery of Garendon, consisting of fourteen manors, besides rectories, lands, and tenements elsewhere. The Duke, by the way, is patron of twenty-nine livings, of several of which he is lay rector. I can find only Barkston, and one or two other places in Leicester, which the Manners have obtained by purchase, but at least a score of places which were once ecclesiastical property granted to the first Earl of Rutland, and which have been sold by him or his successors. The Leicestershire possessions of this family have been largely increased by Inclosure Acts. In 1766 an Inclosure Act was passed for the parish of Braunston: one-seventh of 1,500 acres was awarded to the rector, all the rest to the Duke of Rutland. The Priory of Olveston, to which appertained the Manor of Muston and the Lordships of Saltly and Besealdeby, was one of the Earl of Rutland's grants. An Inclosure Act was passed affecting 2,124 acres in the parish, of which the Duke's share was 2,044.

The manor of Howes with the rectory was originally part of the possessions of Croxton Abbey above referred to. The whole lordship consisted of about 2,000 acres, half of which was old enclosure. In 1791 an Inclosure Act was passed by which the Duke received one-fourteenth of the rest as lord of the manor, and one-seventh in conjunction with the vicar, as impropiator. Inclosure Acts by which the Duke of Rutland largely benefited were also passed for Harby, Waltham, and other parishes. One of those organs of "Society" which flourish by toadying to great houses and publishing wretched scandals concerning them, recently lauded the Duke of Rutland for extending the allotment system, which it was admitted he found decidedly profitable. The landless, voteless peasantry are doubtless thankful enough for small mercies; but, for my part, I am unable to appreciate the generosity which first of all, by class legislation, appropriates the ancient common rights of the poor, and now lets the newly-enclosed lands to the poor at higher rates than the neighbouring farmers pay.

The Derbyshire estates are mostly spoil of the Norman Conquest. William Peveril, half-brother to William the Conqueror, obtained immense grants of land in that county, a large part of which were held under him by the Avenels, another Norman family. Subsequently Peveril's possessions reverted to the Crown, and the Avenels obtained a grant of most of them. In process of time they passed by marriage to the Vernons,

who added to them by marriages with heiresses of the Pyke and Pembridge families. In 1635 Sir George Vernon had no less than thirty manors in Derbyshire. Sir George had two daughters, one of whom, Dorothy, made a runaway match with a younger son of the Earl of Rutland, and brought most of her father's property with her. On the failure of the elder Rutland line her descendants came into possession of the Manners as well as the Vernon property.

The Cambridgeshire and Suffolk estates came into the family by the marriage of the eldest son of one of the Dukes of Rutland with a daughter of the Duke of Somerset. She brought as her dowry the lands at Newmarket, Cheveley, Exning, and Lidgate. The land at Lidgate was purchased by the Duke of Somerset, whose daughter married into the Manners family, but the rest is, I have no doubt, spoil of the Norman Conquest. I find most of it came into the hands of the Seymours (Dukes of Somerset) by the marriage of an heiress of the Allington family, which held these lands for several generations, and that the Allingtons in their turn derived them from the Argentines, whose ancestor, D'Argenton, came over with the Conqueror.

I cannot refrain from giving one little incident, as throwing some light upon the way in which England was governed at the beginning of the present century. The borough of Grantham lay contiguous to the estates of the Duke of Rutland and Lord Brownlow, and was the joint pocket-borough of these two noblemen. In 1802 Sir William Manners, an offshoot of the ducal family, had bought nearly all the houses in the place, and determined to run two candidates of his own. He was defeated; but as the customary price of votes had hitherto been two guineas each, and at this election suddenly rose to ten, the rivals were anxious to avoid such an extraordinary expenditure in the future. Lord Brownlow sold the property out of which his influence arose, and the Duke of Rutland concluded a treaty of peace with Sir William, by which he agreed not to interfere with the baronet's exclusive rights in future, in consideration of being allowed the privilege of shooting over Sir William Manners' property.

The younger sons of this illustrious house have occasionally been provided for by a grateful country. For instance, in the year 1772 Lord Robert Manners obtained a lease from the Crown, for 49½ years, of 36 houses in Marylebone, the annual

value of which was £1,200. For this lease he had to pay £250 cash down and an annual rent of £102 9s. for 33 years, and of £150 for the remainder of the term—a very profitable transaction for Lord Robert Manners.

The present landed possessions of the Duke of Rutland are as follows :—

Leicestershire.	30,109 acres.
Derbyshire	26,973 „
Cambridge	6,554 „
Lincoln	2,864 „
Suffolk	1,658 „
Rutland.	761 „
Notts	102 „

in all 69,021 acres, annual rental £89,948. The motto of the family is “*Pour y parvenir*”—To attain to the object ; and if their object has been “to join house to house and lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth,” it must be admitted that it has been steadily and successfully kept in view.

The Cecils.

(SALISBURY BRANCH.)



THE Cecils assert that they come of an ancient Herefordshire family, though some have maintained that one of their ancestors was an innkeeper at Stamford. The question is of little importance ; a race that can boast of descent from the great Minister of Elizabeth need have no shame in regard to its prior obscurity. David Cecil, the first of the family of whose position anything positive is known, was Water-bailiff of Whittlesea and Alderman of Stamford, a well-to-do middle-class man, who bequeathed his daughter the moderate sum of £20 at his death. His son Richard was page, and afterwards Groom of the Robes, to Henry VIII., and subsequently held other offices. He found the trade of courtier very profitable. I find that he first obtained a grant from the Crown of lands at Maxey (Northamptonshire) ; next the site of the Priory of St. Michael, Stamford ; next the manor castle and estate of Essendine, in Rutland ; beside other estates in Kent and Lincolnshire ; and, finally, in the first year of Edward VI., a grant of Tinwell Manor, in Northamptonshire. This was pretty well for a beginning, but his son and grandson made the courtier business pay still better.

The son of Richard, William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley, having already obtained the favour of Henry, married a daughter of the tutor of Edward VI., and on the death of the lady, a year or two after, he married the daughter of King Edward's other tutor. As so much Church property was being thrown away at this time, young Cecil, of course, endeavoured to obtain a share, but being then but a jackal he had to content himself with some of the bones which such lions as Clinton, Audley, and Russell had not picked clean. Thus I find that he obtained a grant of a hospital at Lincoln, worth £30 a-year in the time of Edward III. ; a monastic site at Stamford, worth £36 17s. a year ; and the office of Master of Requests, whose

annual value, according to his own account, was £240. These sums should be multiplied twentyfold to bring them to something like their present value. On November 5th, 1551, he obtained "an enormous grant of estates from the King," and subsequently of Ladybrigg Close and other lands in Northamptonshire. He held the post of Secretary of State, an office of importance, but far inferior in dignity and responsibility to that of a Secretary of State at the present time. Cecil was a docile follower of the Protector Somerset till the fall of that statesman, and then became equally useful to Northumberland. He would have willingly served Mary, but as he would not renounce his Protestantism, he had to keep quiet and bide his time. At Elizabeth's accession he once more came to the front, and became her most trusted adviser, a position which he long worthily held. In the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth he received a grant of the manors of Geddings and Boxe in Hertfordshire, and two years after a grant of the Hundred of Hertford (part of the ancient possessions of the Crown), together with the Hundred of Braugling, and their rights, members, and appurtenances. Subsequently he received other extensive grants, to which I have alluded when referring to the Exeter branch of the family. He built three great mansions, two of which—Burghley House, near Stamford, and Burghley or Cecil House, in the Strand—passed to his eldest son; the third—Theobalds, in Herts—was intended for his younger son Robert, afterwards Earl of Salisbury.

Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign Robert Cecil rose high in her favour. As to his public conduct I will only quote Lord Clarendon's testimony: "No act of power was ever proposed which he did not advance and execute with the utmost rigour. No man so great a tyrant in this country." At Elizabeth's death Robert Cecil, who had already commended himself to King James, rose into still greater power. Though he was a younger son, and lived only to 50 years of age, he died immensely rich, and no wonder. In 1581 the Queen granted to William Cecil, and to Robert in reversion, various lordships, manors, lands, etc., in the counties of Sussex, Norfolk, Lincoln, York, Kent, and Essex, formerly held by Lord Dacre. When James came to the throne his offices and grants were multiplied. He became Keeper of the King's game in Herts, Essex, and Middlesex, Keeper of Somerset House and Garden, Bailiff of East Greenwich, Keeper of Greenwich Park, and Keeper of

Hyde Park for life. He obtained grants of tithes in Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and Lancashire, also of the Castle of Old Sarum, also of the lands of Charles Brooke, also of a large piece of land in the Strand, also of lands in Kent, part of Lord Cobham's estates. Then, in conjunction with Popham, he obtained a grant of one-fifteenth of every hundredweight of copper raised in eight English counties and in all Wales. He also obtained a grant of the parks and rectory of Brigstock, Northamptonshire, afterwards sold to Lord Torrington, and the site of Furness Abbey, with the appurtenances, for a nominal rent, which he also sold to advantage. He made a most advantageous bargain with King James by "exchanging" his small estate of Theobalds for the magnificent domain of Hatfield, including Hatfield Woods, Innings Park, and Miller's Park. It is said by Welden that he managed to obtain several other large slices of Crown lands at a very cheap rate without incurring public odium. King James lavished the property of the Crown upon his needy Scotch favourites, and Robert Cecil, whose office enabled him to expedite the grants, bought them up at a low price. When the descendant of this land-jobbing statesman, while defending his own extravagant claims last year, warned the London ratepayers against allowing the Metropolitan Board of Works to become land-jobbers, he had evidently forgotten how the first Lord Salisbury grew rich. In the fifth year of James's reign, Robert Cecil, being then Earl of Salisbury, obtained a grant of the manor, rectory, advowsons of the vicarage, glebe lands, and tithes of Cranbourne, in Dorset. The next time the Marquis of Salisbury speaks against Disestablishment it might be worth his while to explain how it can be wrong for Mr. Miall to advocate the disendowment of the Church, and right for the Cecils still to hold part of the ancient endowments of the Church. Four years after this grant had been made the Earl of Salisbury obtained another, of "the hundred and lordship and manor of Cranbourne, the chase and free warren, the site and capital messuage of the manor and demesne lands, the profits of the fairs, Castle Hill and Burwood, coppices, manors of Upper or Over Niland, Lower Niland, Stalbridge, Weston, Isle of Brownsea, and vil of Poole." I have reason to believe that the list I have given is by no means exhaustive. His son, the second earl, obtained from Charles I. a grant of the manor and castle of Hertford, also of the manor of Hertingfordbury, Herts, which were subsequently

sold out of the family. Many of the grants of the two great Cecils were sold by them, but in the grants, or exchanges, I have noticed are included most of the property of the present Marquis, whose rent-roll, exclusive of London property, amounts to £33,294. He holds in all 20,122 acres. In

Hertfordshire	13,389 acres.
Dorset	3,118 „
Lancashire	1,796 „
Middlesex	960 „
Essex	758 „
Beds and Wilts	101 „

I have already accounted for the Herts and Dorset estates ; the small estate in Lancashire came into the family by marriage.

The Marquis of Salisbury, as the metropolitan ratepayers have reason to know, owns valuable property in London ; Robert Cecil, the first Earl of Salisbury, built himself a stately mansion on the south side of the Strand. Though I have not been able to discern the date of the actual grant, I have not the least doubt that the site on which it stood was granted by the Crown, because I find that it was in the possession of the Crown shortly before the time of Robert Cecil ; that Robert Cecil did obtain a grant of a large piece of land in the Strand ; and, as I have shown, Robert Cecil could obtain from the King almost anything he chose to ask. On the site of Salisbury House now stand Salisbury and Cecil Streets, and sundry dilapidated sheds which are an eyesore to the Thames Embankment. I cannot but think that the Marquis has treated the London ratepayers very shabbily. The Embankment has certainly improved the value of streets on the south side of the Thames, in one of which I know that the rents of offices have risen about 50 per cent. within the last few years. Sooner or later the Marquis will derive the benefit so far as his own streets are concerned. But he first of all obliges the Metropolitan Board of Works to make a road behind the garden, leading to nowhere save his old sheds, and then brings an action because they have not made it wide enough. The Act of 1875 was introduced for the benefit of his property according to the *Times*. By the way, when working-men candidates are talked of there is a cry of class representation ; we never think of that when peers are concerned. By the Act of 1875 the Board were bound to make a road twenty-five feet wide. They made

it, but it had nine feet footway and sixteen feet carriage-way—twenty-five feet in all; quite broad enough, as anyone can see, for a road leading nowhere. Thereupon the Marquis actually brought an action in 1877 to compel the Board to make the carriage way alone 25ft. wide. Judgment was given for the Marquis, but the Lord Chief Justice said “he arrived at this conclusion with regret, for he thought that the Board was right in their view as a matter of judgment and discretion with a view to the benefit of the public.” Mr. Justice Mellor also said he arrived at the same conclusion with the same regret. So much for the Shylock rendering of that bond.

The case of the new proposed street from Tottenham-court-road to Charing-cross was still worse. The Metropolitan Board of Works proposed to make this street through certain property possessed by the Marquis, and to take his land at its actual value, plus the usual 10 per cent., with adequate compensation to his leaseholders. But the Marquis wanted his property to be increased in value to the tune of about £50,000 at the expense of the ratepayers. They were to pay him for the land required for the street itself, and then to let him re-purchase without competition the valuable frontage sites when the street was completed. The Board, who expected to recoup themselves to some extent by the sale of the frontage sites, withdrew the Bill when this monstrous proposal was accepted *by the House of Lords*; and, had it not been for the spirited conduct of Mr. Fawcett and others, the Bill would have been abandoned. Not till the proceedings of the Marquis had evoked the condemnation of the whole of the metropolitan press did he recede from his position. Lord Redesdale, the Chairman of the Lords Committees, distinctly declared that the Board was in the right. An old Westminster elector once told me that the land was formerly Lammas land, and that at one time the parish of St. Martin’s contemplated trying the right of the Marquis to the property, especially as he refused to show his title. Further, that, several generations ago, when a Lord Salisbury was churchwarden he rented this land of the parish, for a few shillings yearly, and that, strange to say, the volume of the minutes of the parish at the time when this Lord Salisbury was churchwarden is missing. I do not vouch for the correctness of this, but I have reason to believe that it has some foundation.

The Herberts.

(PEMBROKE LINE.)



THREE earldoms—Carnarvon, Powis, and Pembroke—are held by different branches of this fortunate family; at present I confine my attention to the latter branch, inasmuch as it affords a remarkably good illustration not only of a house built up on Church property, but built up almost entirely upon a single grant. With the exception of a small house of Black Friars at Wilton, the only grant of monastic land in Wilts obtained by the Herberts was Wilton Abbey, and the lands thereto belonging, which Speed—who always gives the highest estimate—considers to have then had an annual value of £652 11s. 5d. I wish to show what kind of an estate that represents now. First of all, however, let it be clearly understood that when the suppression of the religious houses was first projected, Henry VIII. commended it to Parliament as a measure of which the nation was to gain the greater part of the benefit. Sir Edward Coke thus writes:—"On the King's behalf the members of both Houses were informed in Parliament that no King or kingdom was safe but when the King had three abilities: 1. To live of his own, and able to defend his kingdom on any sudden invasion or insurrection. 2. To aid his confederates, otherwise they would never assist him. 3. To reward his well-deserving servants. Now the project was, that if Parliament would give unto him all the abbeys, priories, friaries, nunneries, and other monasteries, that for ever in time then to come he would take order that the same *should not be converted to private uses*; but first, that his Exchequer for the purposes aforesaid should be enriched; second, the kingdom strengthened by a continual maintenance of forty thousand well-trained soldiers, with skilful captains and commanders; thirdly, for the benefit and ease of the subject, who never afterwards (as was projected) in any time to come should be charged with subsidies, fifteenths, loans, or other common aids; fourthly, lest the

honour of the realm should receive any diminution of honour by the dissolution of the said monasteries, there being twenty-nine lords of Parliament of the abbots and priors, that the King would create a number of nobles." In effect the new nobles got almost everything; all the fine promises of a remission of taxation were ignored.

Beside about 2,000 acres of land in Ireland, the Earl of Pembroke owns 39,600 acres in Wiltshire, the annual rental of the latter being £43,162. In the neighbourhood of Wilton the Herberts are looked upon with almost as much awe and reverence as if they held their title deeds direct from the Divine hand. To me Wiltshire has always appeared remarkable as possessing a peculiarly rich ancient history, and a set of landed proprietors of mushroom growth. The Stourtons are an exception, but the Ashley-Coopers, the Bouveries, the Nelsons, the Thynnes, the Bennet-Stanfords, and the Herberts, are all comparatively modern families. Till the reign of Henry VIII. the Herberts did not own a foot of land in the county.

The Herberts, of course, claim Norman descent, going back to Herbert Fitzherbert, Chamberlain of Henry I., one of whose descendants became Earl of Pembroke, who, though he had no successor in his earldom, had a bastard son, whose son, William Herbert, having become a courtier of Henry VIII., received from that monarch a grant of the Wilton Abbey lands. At the death of Henry he became one of the principal members of the Government, and put down a rebellion in the West of England, which had been caused mainly by the oppressive conduct of the nobles. To repay the charges to which Herbert and other members of the Council alleged they had been put in this expedition, they formed a scheme whereby £150,000 of base silver was thrown into circulation, Herbert's profit being £6,709. Shortly after he was created, or created himself, Earl of Pembroke, and was one of the chief authors of the organised system of plunder to which I have more than once alluded. Of all the base statesmen of that period, Herbert, according to Mr. Froude, made the most of his opportunities. In Queen Mary's reign the nuns came back to Wilton Abbey, and, according to Aubrey, Herbert "came to the gate with his cap in hand, and falling on his knees to the lady abbess and nuns, cried *peccavi*; but upon Queen Mary's death the Earl came to Wilton like a tiger, and turned them out, crying, 'Out, ye ——! To work, to work; go spin!'"

Independently of the lucrative offices which he held at various times, I find that the founder of the present House of Pembroke obtained from King Henry VIII. an annuity of £46 13s. 4d., who also bequeathed him £300 at his death. He also obtained grants of monastic houses at Malpas, in Glamorganshire; Dunstable, in Bedfordshire; Horton, in Dorset; Clifford, in Herefordshire; and the manors of Barton and Cam in Wilts. Nearly all these possessions have, at one time or another, passed out of the family. It does not appear that the descendants of the first Earl have made any large additions to his possessions, though his son, by the way, held, in the reigns of James I. and Charles I., a long lease of the extensive estate of the See of Salisbury at Downton—one of those peculiar ecclesiastical leases of which I have already spoken, where all the advantage was on the side of the lessee.

I now come to the Wilton Abbey grant. Wilton House itself is built upon the site of the Abbey, which was one of the most ancient monastic houses in the kingdom, founded, it is said, in the time of Egbert, and reconstituted by Alfred the Great. Herbert obtained a grant of the Abbey lands as well as the site. I have endeavoured to collect from "Hoare's Modern Wiltshire" a list of these lands, though it is probably not complete. They included the Manors of Avene or Avon, Washerne, North Burcombe, Ditchampton, Wily (nearly 1,600 acres), Little Longford (900 acres), South Newnton, including Little Wishford (1,800 acres), Stoford, Burden's Ball, Chilhampton, Ugford, Netherhampton, Swallowcliffe, Fovant, Chilmark, Berwick St. John, with the rectory (subsequently sold out of the family), Aston, Broadchalke, fee farm rents at Bridmore, and lands in Whiteparish and other places.

On the other hand, the only acquisitions I have been able to find since the time of the first Earl of Pembroke are Little Langford, purchased of the Vaughans; Flamstone, 1,070 acres, purchased of the Stourtons; and sundry lands in Knighton, Ebbesbourne, and Berwick St. John, purchased of various owners, and Stoke Verdon, which probably came into the possession of the family by marriage. There have probably been a few acquisitions of more recent date; but it is unquestionable that the Herberts held no land in Wiltshire till they acquired Wilton Abbey, and that their subsequent acquisitions by purchase are more than counterbalanced by the grants of the first

Earl of Pembroke in the counties of Dorset, Beds, Hereford, and Glamorgan.

It must not be forgotten that, in addition to lands, many of the old monastic houses were possessed of rectories; *i.e.*, they received the great tithes and paid a priest a small sum to do duty in the parish as vicar. Wilton Abbey had certain rectories among its endowments, which at the dissolution of the monasteries came into the possession of the Earl of Pembroke, viz., South Newnton, St. Bernard Stanton, and Ditchampton. What is the value of the great tithes of these places I am not in a position to say. Wilton Abbey likewise held the advowsons of several parishes, in most cases the lordship of the manor and the advowson going together. These advowsons were also included in the Herbert grant; and the Earl of Pembroke, beside the vicarages before-mentioned, is patron of the following livings:—Wilton, annual value, £400, and a house; Great Wishford, £342, and a house; Wylye, £492, and a house; Chilmark, £426; Fovant, £465, and a house; Chalbury, £168, and a house; Fugglestone, £482, and a house; Little Langford, £145, and a house; also Bishopston, £806, and a house, obtained by a separate grant from the Crown. Of course, from these livings the Earl of Pembroke derives no present pecuniary benefit, but they would fetch some few thousands at the Auction Mart, and in the event of the abolition of private patronage, or the disendowment of the Church, the Earl would doubtless put in his claim for compensation.

The Sackville-Wests.



THE agrarian history of some of our great houses is often rendered not a little intricate by the failure of a direct male line, and the marriages of heiresses and co-heiresses into other families. Earl Delawarr and Lord Buckhurst are the representatives of three ancient families—the Delawarrs, Wests, and Sackvilles; so far as the peerage is concerned, the two former noble houses have greater antiquity than the Sackvilles, but the Sackvilles have the pre-eminence in dignity and importance. At the death of Charles Sackville, fifth Duke of Dorset, in 1843, all his honours became extinct, but he left two daughters—the Countesses Amherst and Delawarr. The latter was subsequently created Baroness Buckhurst, the title to descend to the next eldest of her sons, to the one who should succeed to the Delawarr peerage.

There were Barons West and Delawarr as early as the days of Edward III., but it will hardly be necessary to travel back so far, inasmuch as the greater part of the lands of the family are situated in Sussex, and nearly all of these have been acquired in comparatively modern times. Indeed, one reason which has induced me to glance at the history of this house is that I may illustrate the fact that it by no means follows that because a family boasts of ancient peerage it can boast of ancient tenure of its lands. The Lord Delawarr who died in 1451 was possessed of the following manors in Sussex:—Offington, Sutton, Portslade, Folkington, Aldrington, Fletching, Ripe, Excit, Twehurst, and Bletchington. All but the two last have passed out of the family by sale or otherwise, and possibly those two also, as I have no information as to them one way or the other. The Wests had some good slices of the monastic lands. Wherwell Abbey, annual value £403 12s. 10d., was granted to Thomas West, Lord Delawarr; and Little Derby Monastery, annual value £285 9s. 6d., to Sir Thomas West. The figures, of course, require to be multiplied by twenty at the very least. Most, if not of all these lands have also passed out of the family.

Earl Delawarr is the owner of 11,185 acres of land in Sussex, which produce an annual rental of £10,825. Lord Buckhurst has 2,720 acres in that county, with the great tithes of East Grinstead, which were obtained by a Royal grant. The manor of Hartfield was obtained by the marriage of one of the Delawarr family with a Norman heiress, the Manor of Ringmer was obtained by purchase, but the greater part of the property will be accounted for later on.

Let us now turn to the Sackvilles. The family is of Norman origin ; but, though the Sackvilles are said to have at one time held certain manors in Suffolk and Essex, they were of no considerable note prior to the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth. One of them had, however, married the heiress of another Norman house, who brought the manor of Buckhurst into the family. Sir Richard Sackville held the lucrative office of Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, and therefore had good opportunities of possessing himself of certain church lands in Sussex. He obtained a grant of the manor of Brighthelmstone-Michelham, formerly held by a priory in that place, and the site of the stately priory of Lewes, where the Sackvilles subsequently built a mansion, was divided between him and Baker, Elizabeth's Attorney-General. I believe, too, that the manor of Munchloe was one of Elizabeth's grants to Richard Sackville, inasmuch as it was formerly monastic property, and in her reign came into Sackville's possession. But as by this time most of the abbey lands had been given away, it was necessary to spoil the Reformed Church. During a vacancy in the See of Chichester, Elizabeth laid hands on the manor of Bexhill belonging to that See, and granted it to this fortunate Sackville ; and the dean and chapter of Chichester having been induced to surrender the manor of Wilmington to the Queen, she disposed of it in like manner. Besides holding various lucrative offices, the Sackvilles subsequently came in for a few other good things. For instance, in the reign of Charles II. the Earl of Dorset obtained a grant from that monarch of the manor of Stratford-on-Avon, together with the rectory.

The family has been further enriched by several fortunate marriages. Lord Buckhurst owns 2,342 acres in Gloucestershire, with the rectory of Weston-on-Avon, derived mainly, if not entirely, from the marriage of one of his ancestors with the daughter of Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex, an upstart favourite of James I., who, after enriching himself by extor-

tion and bribery, was dismissed from office, tried, and condemned for his misconduct. Lord Delawarr owns 2,941 acres in Oxfordshire, derived from the marriage of one of his ancestors with an heiress of the Cope family; he also owns a mansion and 3,240 acres of land near Royston, in Cambridge-shire, derived by the marriage of one of his predecessors with the heiress of the Leyell family, by whom the property was honestly purchased.

The mansion of Knole, at Sevenoaks, which stands in an extensive and beautiful park, was recently the subject of litigation between Lords Delawarr and Buckhurst. Had it not been for the discreditable conduct of the ancestors of these noble lords, and of the trustees of a great charity, Knole would to this day have been the property of the poor of certain parishes in Surrey. The history of the place is somewhat interesting. Kent can boast of many an ancient hall, but of hardly any so widely famed as Knole, unless it be that stately seat at Penshurst, which is for ever associated with the honoured names of Sidney and Spencer. After passing through various hands, it was purchased, in 1456, by a certain Archbishop of Canterbury, who, having rebuilt the house and enclosed the park, bequeathed it as a palace to his successors for ever. Cranmer yielded up Knole to Henry VIII., as well as Otford, another archiepiscopal seat three miles off, one of whose ruined towers is now converted into a blacksmith's shop—another instance of the fact that the spoiling of the Church was by no means confined to monastic lands. Subsequently Elizabeth made a grant of this lordly domain to Thomas Sackville, afterwards Earl of Dorset. Beside the mansion, it included the manors of Knole, Seal, and Kemsing (and Sevenoaks, according to Entick's "History of Kent"). In the reign of James I. the then Earl of Dorset was in difficulties, and mortgaged this property to Alderman Henry Smith, of London, and a few years after Smith purchased the same absolutely. Smith, who devoted his immense wealth to founding various charities, vested the property in trustees for the benefit of the poor of certain parishes in Surrey. In 1653, the surviving trustees, Lord Lumley and another, leased the property to the Earl of Dorset for £130 per annum. In the thirteenth year of Charles II. an Act of Parliament was passed reciting that "as the house was only fit for a person of honour" (!) "the said manor house and park, together with

certain royalties in the manors of Knole, Seal, and Kemsing, the advowsons and the woods in the wastes, should be vested in the said Earl, discharged of the said rents, and of all charitable uses," in consideration of a rent-charge of £130 per annum being settled on the Earl's estates. The £130 per annum was to be divided among certain parishes, of which St. George's, St. Saviour's, and St. Olave's, Southwark, Bermondsey, and Clapham are situated within the Metropolitan area.

The annual proceeds of the remainder of the property were distributed among twelve other parishes in Surrey, including St. Thomas's, Southwark, Rotherhithe, Newington, Lambeth, Camberwell, and Battersea. Let us see how that portion was treated. In the 13th year of George I., Smith's trustees parted with sixteen acres of land, adjoining Knole Park, to the Sackvilles, then producing £8 annually, for a rent-charge of £10 per year. Later on, in the reign of George III., another Act of Parliament was passed, authorising Smith's trustees to hand over the manors of Knole, Kemsing, and Seal to the Duke of Dorset, in exchange for a farm in the parish of Reigate, and two rent-charges of £55 per annum. The property given up by the trustees produced £167 14s. per annum, and that which they received produced £220 15s. That looks liberal on the surface, if the official figures were correct. But let us sum up the whole series of bargains, and see what is the result of the swindling system of rent charges. I find that the Sackville-Wests hold at the present time 1,501 acres in Kent, producing an annual rental of £3,076. I have failed to discover any property of theirs in Kent which did not formerly belong to Smith's Charities. Possibly they may have a few acres beside, but without doubt nearly the whole—all so far as I can ascertain—was once the property of the poor of Surrey. What have the poor got in exchange? Three rent-charges of £130, £10, and £55, and a farm. In 1838 this farm produced £210. From a calculation based on the increased amounts paid in 1865 to the parishes interested, I conclude that the value of the farm had then increased to £235. Let us assume that its present value is £250, and we have four sums amounting in all to £445. Unless the Sackville-Wests possess a few odd acres in Kent that did not once belong to Smith's Charity, and which would slightly alter the figures, it follows that by these successive transactions, of

the character of which I leave my readers to judge, this noble family possesses a splendid mansion and park, and a rental of £3,076 a-year, for a payment of £445 a-year to the poor, under agreements made at various times by their ancestors. The poorest labourer in Kent, who pays half-a-crown a week for his cottage and garden, can lift up his head proudly and thank God that he holds neither house nor land under such conditions.

XVII.

The Scotts.



HOW many of the great names that adorned the Peerage a hundred and fifty or two hundred years ago have vanished! Where, for instance, are the Dukedoms of Bolton, Montagu, Kingston, Kent, Ormond, and Bridgwater? The Peerage knows them no more. *Sic transit gloria mundi.* But the estates once held by these great houses have not passed away; for the most part they have been absorbed, by the marriages of heiresses, into the possessions of other great houses. This is one of the main causes of the vast accumulations, which have no parallels in our history save in the times of the Norman Kings, under whom, by the way, enormous grants were somewhat counter-balanced by frequent resumptions. I gave recently a striking instance of absorption of estate upon estate through the marriages of the Leveson-Gowers with the Sutherlands and the Mackenzies; the Scotts afford an almost equally remarkable example.

The Duke of Buccleugh and Queensberry; Marquis of Dumfriesshire; Earl of Drumlanrig, Buccleugh, Sanquhar, and Dalkeith; Viscount Nith, Thostholwold, and Ross; Baron Douglas in the Peerage of Scotland; and Earl of Doncaster and Baron Tynedale in the Peerage of England, owns land in seven Scotch and five English counties, and is patron of eleven church livings. Besides the palatial mansion of Montagu House, Whitehall, and a house at Richmond, in Surrey, the Duke possesses the following seats:—Boughton House, Northamptonshire; Ditton Park, Slough; Beaulieu, Hampshire; Dalkeith House, East Park, and Smeaton, near Edinburgh; Drumlanrig Castle and Laugholm, Dumfriesshire; Branxsholme, Roxburgh; and Bowhill, Selkirk; twelve mansions in all. His landed property is thus distributed:—

Dumfries	253,514 acres.
Roxburgh	104,461 „
Selkirk	60,428 „
Northampton	17,965 „
Lanark	9,091 „
Warwick	6,881 „
Edinburgh.	3,532 „
Hants	1,065 „
Kirkcudbright	1,000 „
Bucks	894 „
Lancaster	369 „
Fife	60 „
<hr/>	
Total	459,260 „

The annual rental of these estates is £238,401. In order to keep within reasonable limits I can but glance at these several properties.

Let us first take the English estates, from which the Duke draws £43,630 annually. These he mostly derives from the marriage of the third Duke of Buccleugh with the only daughter and heiress of the last Duke of Montagu, and thus on the maternal side is steeped up to the neck in ecclesiastical property and Crown grants. Sir Edward Montagu, Lord Chief Justice in the reign of Henry VIII., does not seem to have been quite so greedy as many of his contemporaries, but he obtained grants from the monarch of the manor of Barnwell St. Andrew, formerly a monastic estate; of Kingsthorpe; and also of lands in several parishes, formerly part of the endowments of Ramsey and Thorney Abbeys; for the latter paying a nominal sum of money. Boughton (the Duke's present seat) and some other manors were purchased by Sir Edward. One of his descendants in the reign of Charles I. obtained a grant, by which "the manors, demesnes, parishes, towns, hamlets, and places of Boughton, Weckley and Warkton, containing 2,285 acres, with woods and lands in Geddington 175 acres, and a small wood called Thicket, should be put out of the Forest of Rockingham and disafforested." The same Montagu obtained a grant for three lives of the Keepership of Rockingham Forest—a grant which was confirmed by George I. After the grant made by Charles I. there still remained 203 acres of woodland in Geddington, which the Montagus obtained from Charles II. Just about the time of the Revolution, the Duke of Montagu purchased from Lord Sunderland the office of Master of the Wardrobe, and subsequently sold it to the nation

for the payment of £2,200 a year, to be enjoyed not only by himself, but by his sons after him.

The Bucks estate, Ditton Park, near Slough, also came to the Duke through the Montagus, who had in turn derived it by marriage from the Winwoods. How the Winwoods obtained it I cannot say positively, but I have no doubt at all that it was by a Royal grant. It was the residence of Queen Mary before her accession, and Lysons tells us in his "Magna Britannia" that "it belonged to the Crown in the reign of Queen Elizabeth." Sir Ralph Winwood was principal Secretary of State to James I., and we know how lavishly royal property was flung away by that exemplary monarch. The Beaulieu estate is also derived from the Montagus, one of whom married the co-heir of the Earl of Southampton. Wriothesley Lord Southampton was one of the greediest of the *entourage* of Henry VIII., and Beaulieu Abbey was a portion of his ill-gotten gains. The Lancashire estate, also derived from the Montagus, was originally Crown land. The Honour of Blackburn, consisting of Colne Burnley and several other manors, with the lordship of the liberty of Furness, was granted by Charles II. to Monk, Duke of Albemarle, whose widow bequeathed a portion thereof to her stepson, a Montagu. The Warwickshire estates are also derived from the Montagus.

The Scotts themselves, like all the old borderers, were renowned cattle thieves, men whose deeds in modern times in the Western States of America would have secured them a short shrift and a long rope from Judge Lynch. The first Scott who migrated from Lanark to Roxburgh remarked that he had no doubt the cattle of Cumberland would be found as good as the cattle of Teviotdale. Whoever is curious to learn what manner of man "the bold Buccleugh" of olden times was, has only to peruse Scott's "Lay of the Last Minstrel" and the accompanying notes. There he will learn how Scott of Buccleugh obtained Eskdale, the lands which the Beattisons tilled, and from one of whom, Earl Morton, claiming to be lord, demanded a horse; how the Beattisons repudiated his claim; and how Earl Morton, escaping to the castle of the Scotts, sold his lordship over the Beattisons (not over their lands) to Scott, with the injunction that he should kill all save one; how Scott, taking with him 500 men, massacred the Beattisons, and then appropriated Eskdale to himself. There he will learn, too, how Braxsholme Hall, the seat of the Scotts,

was a mere nest of robbers, of whom William of Deloraine was the type :—

“Steady of heart and stout of hand
As ever drove prey from Cumberland ;
Five times outlawed had he been
By England’s King and Scotland’s Queen.”

There he will also be informed that the lands of Deloraine are joined to those of Buccleugh in Ettrick Forest, and that they were immemorially possessed by the Buccleugh family (*i.e.*, from the time when that family migrated from Lanark) under the strong title of occupancy, although no charter was obtained from the Crown for several generations. In Elizabeth’s reign the Scott of that time carried on his robber forays when the two countries were at peace, rescued one of his cut-throats from Carlisle gaol, and was sent to England as a hostage by James, who subsequently converted the bandit into an earl. The Dalkeith estates were obtained by purchase from an Earl of Morton, who had impoverished himself in supporting Charles I., by an Earl of Buccleugh, who left a daughter Anne as his heiress. Charles II., who usually provided for his bastards by matrimonial alliances with great heiresses, caused her to be married at eleven years of age to his son the Duke of Monmouth. Monmouth was personally well provided for by his father, and though on his rebellion his personal estates were forfeited, in 1687 they were restored to the duchess and her descendants. Francis, the second duke, married the daughter and heiress of the Duke of Queensberry, by whom were derived the immense estates in Dumfriesshire.

The Duke of Montagu had formerly a mansion on the spot where now stands Montagu House. In 1768 the Duke of Montagu obtained a lease of a messuage and other buildings which had been erected on the privy garden of Whitehall Palace. The term was 50 years. The Duke paid £200 cash down, and an annual rent of £28 10s. The annual value of the property when the lease had half run its length was £300. For the same term of 50 years he had a piece of ground adjoining, reaching to half way between high and low water mark in the river Thames, at an annual rental of £1. In 1806 the Duke of Buccleugh, who had inherited the Montagu property, surrendered the old lease and obtained a new one. The annual value of the whole property being then £596 8s. 8d., he was allowed to pay a rental of £75 16s. till the year 1818,

and £592 16s. a year afterwards till 1868, the Duke engaging to rebuild the house. In 1855 the present Duke surrendered the old lease and obtained a new one from the Crown, and replaced old Montagu House by the present palatial structure. The present Duke distinguished himself by his determined opposition to the Thames Embankment Bill, and almost succeeded in his attempt. He could not brook the idea of a Metropolitan Board of Works bringing a wide public road betwixt the river and his nobility, and in his absurd opposition to the Bill he was seconded by the Duke of Northumberland, the Marquis of Salisbury, and other noble landowners, whose properties were afterwards greatly enhanced in value by the passage of the Bill. Whether their opposition was genuine, or was evoked by a desire to drive as hard a bargain as possible, I shall not pretend to decide. In years to come people will wonder how any man could have the audacity to propose that the Embankment roadway should slant off just beyond Charing-cross Bridge into Parliament-street, instead of being continued to Westminster Bridge, simply to gratify a ducal leaseholder. In vain architects and valuers like Mr. Pownall, Mr. Shaw, and Captain Galton gave evidence that the Embankment would actually enhance the value of the property; the Duke stoutly maintained that to replace a wide expanse of foetid mud by two-fifths of an acre of garden ground would be to do him a serious injury. In the end the Duke was defeated, and the public interest prevailed. However patient the rural districts may be, London, at least, cannot afford to allow a duke to block up the road.

The Pagets.



THE Marquis of Anglesey is the owner of 25,505 acres, distributed as follows:—

Staffordshire	14,344	acres.
Anglesey	8,485	„
Derbyshire	1,539	„
Dorset	1,117	„

He has three seats:—Beaudesert, Staffordshire; Plasnewydd, Anglesey; and Stalbridge Park, Dorset; and is lay rector of four livings in Staffordshire. Prior to the reign of Henry VIII. the Pagets did not own a single acre. The founder of the house was William Paget, son of one of the Sergeants of the Mace in the City. William Paget first entered the service of the Bishop of Winchester, and secured the favour of Henry VIII. by going over to France and procuring the opinion of a number of learned men in Paris in favour of the King's contemplated divorce. In the latter part of Henry's life offices were showered upon Paget in profusion, but he was not without still more substantial rewards. In 1542 the Dean and Chapter of the Collegiate Church of Burton-on-Trent were compelled to surrender the church and all its landed possessions to the King, who in the following January granted the manors of Burton Branston, Bromley, Stretton, Horninglow, Wightmore, and Anslow, in the county of Stafford; and the manors of Winshall, Stapenhall, Caldwell, Overa Magna, Overa Parva, and Findern, in the county of Derby, to William Paget. This was bad enough, but the worst is to follow. There were no bounds to the rapacity of the dishonest crew who ruled England at this period. Mr. Hallam says, "Nor did they content themselves with the escheated wealth of the Church. Almost every bishopric was spoiled by their ravenous power, either through mere alienations, or long leases, or unequal exchanges. Lichfield lost the chief part of its lands to raise an estate for Lord Paget." This is nothing more than the truth; the most valuable portions of the Marquis of Anglesey's estates in Staffordshire were not

lands which had formerly been devoted to what most Englishmen still regard as superstitious uses; they were the possessions of the Bishopric of Lichfield even after the King had altogether broken with Rome. In 1546 the King made a second enormous grant to Paget of the manors of Longdon, Heywood, and Barkeswicke, with their members and appurtenances, situated and lying in Whittington, Fisherwick, Pye, Homerwicke, Wall, Norwhale, Strethay, and Brendwood, all in Staffordshire. Heywood Manor alone contained the parishes and hamlets of Great and Little Heywood, Hustledone, Elesley, Swansmore, and Frodswell. The manor of Longdon was still more extensive, and included Beaudesert, the present seat of the Marquis of Anglesey. In the grant was included Shutborough, where the Bishop had a house, Cannock town and forest, Rugeley, and the parks of Heywood and Beaudesert, and a great number of hamlets and villages in an adjoining Cannock Forest, such as Brereton and other places, where the Marquis has valuable coal-mines. And for all these lands Paget gave nothing in exchange save the impropriations of a few paltry rectories, whose annual value was then £183, which had previously been granted to him by the King. The coal on this estate has been worked ever since the time of Edward VI., who, by the way, confirmed the grant which his father had made.

These were not the only grants made by Henry VIII. to Paget; for instance, he gave him Drayton in Middlesex, which was for a long time the seat of the Pagets, but which was sold by the Earl of Uxbridge some time during the last century. The King also bequeathed him at his death a legacy of three hundred pounds.

Henry also appointed Paget one of his executors. To elevate Paget, however, to a position of authority during the minority of the young King, was very like committing the sparrow to the guardianship of the hawk. Paget became a member of the Council, and a member of the different Commissions that carried out the work of spoliation. He obtained from Edward, or rather in Edward's time, a grant of Exeter-place, in the Strand (where Essex Street now stands), formerly belonging to the Bishops of Exeter, on which was erected the Essex House of a later period. This property was afterwards lost to the family. It has been estimated that Paget's grants of Church lands were worth £20,000 a year even in those times.

Among other lucrative offices which Paget held in the reign of Edward VI. was that of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. It might have been expected that a man who had been raised by Royal favour from a position of poverty and obscurity to one of almost boundless wealth, would have been so far beyond the reach of temptation as to behave with something like common honesty when occupying offices of trust. But it was not so with Paget. King Edward himself thus writes in his journal :—"The Lord Paget, Chancellor of the Duchy, confessed how he did, without commission, sell away my lands and great timber woods ; how he had taken great fines of my lands to his said peculiar profit and advantage, never turning any to my use or commodity ; and how he had made leases in reversion for more than twenty-one years." Poor boy ! he had created Paget a lord, but he could not convert him into an honest servant.

"The King may make a belted knight,
A marquis, duke, and a' that,
But an honest man's above his might."

Though petty offenders in those days were strung up for the most paltry crimes, titled thieves were treated with great gentleness, for no one could tell when it might be his own turn to be found out. The Court of Star Chamber fined Paget £6,000, which was reduced to £4,000, and finally to £2,000, so that he remained in possession of the greater part of the money which he had stolen from his master. Like most of the noble pilferers who were such ardent Protestants in the days of Edward VI., he contrived to obtain the favour of Mary ; and to retain possession of his lands, he even obtained from that Queen additional grants of land in Derbyshire, Leicestershire, and Warwickshire.

The third Lord Paget having been concerned in an intrigue in the interest of Mary Queen of Scots, fled the country, and his estates were confiscated, but his son obtained from James I. a restoration of the paternal honours and estates, most of which have since remained in the possession of the family. I have thus shown whence the Pagets have derived the sixteen thousand acres which they hold in Staffordshire and Derbyshire.

The male line of the Pagets, who had in course of time become Earls of Uxbridge, died out in 1769, and the estates came to Henry Bayley, of Anglesey, son of Sir Nicholas Bayley,

who had married a Paget. On coming into possession of the Paget estates he assumed his mother's name, and was created Earl of Uxbridge in 1784. The first Bayley was one of the hungry Scots who came southward in the train of James I., and being in holy orders he was provided with a feast of fat things in the Church of England. He was first appointed chaplain to Henry, Prince of Wales, then tutor to Prince Charles, afterwards Charles I., and in 1616 he became Bishop of Bangor. There he further improved his fortunes by marriage with a wealthy heiress, and from him the Pagets derive their extensive estates in Anglesey. The Dorsetshire estates of the Pagets in and around Stalbridge were derived by the Bayleys from a marriage into the Walter family, by whose ancestors they were purchased.

Until comparatively recent times the younger branches of the house of Paget have usually contrived to live upon the taxation of the country. About the time of the passing of the first reform Bill there was hardly a living Paget who did not manage to nibble at the revenue. The then Marquis, a gallant soldier whose services deserved ample recognition, but who, according to O'Connell, was declared by the Duke of Wellington to be the greatest fool he ever knew, held several military and other appointments. One of his brothers had an annual pension of £2,000, another of £400, and his sister of £3,766. Beside these, he had nearly twenty relatives, sons, brothers, sons-in-law, nephews, etc., who held offices in the Army, Navy, Court, and Civil Service.

Of the domestic history of the Pagets the less said the better. A former Marquis of Anglesey was twice directly concerned in divorce proceedings in the House of Lords. He first obtained a divorce from his wife, and then himself had to appear in the position of a co-respondent under such aggravated circumstances that the injured husband of the lady was awarded £20,000 damages. His son, the late Marquis, suffered from a similar domestic scandal.

The Fitzwilliams.

IN spite of the exaggerated notions of the rights of property which the present Earl Fitzwilliam not long ago propounded to the colliers on his estates, it is impossible not to feel a certain amount of respect, and even admiration, for this family. It matters nothing to me that it is a great Whig house. In past times the Whig houses have done good service to the popular cause, but nowadays the secession of such magnates as the Duke of Sutherland, Earl Fortescue, and Earl Fitzwilliam is regarded with profound indifference. Whether they are not simply drags upon the activity and energy of the Liberal party, with which it can very well afford to dispense, is a question which I cannot now stay to argue. But in former times the Fitzwilliams were Whigs, and something more. A generation ago Ebenezer Elliott, the Anti-Corn-law rhymers, wrote on the death of an Earl Fitzwilliam :—

“O, ye who died, trampled at Peterloo,
By England's Juggernaut ! Ye, too, who drank
Slowly life's bitterest cup, not drugged with rue,
But brimmed with hopeless pain ; and ye who sank
In blood at Wexford, rolling rank o'er rank,
Like storm-swept waves ! the golden door throw wide,
(It needs no golden key) and hail and thank
The meek, the merciful, who ne'er denied
His aid to want and grief, when they for succour cried.”

The man of whom Elliott wrote was not the only Fitzwilliam who had a just claim upon the gratitude of the common people. The family may have sometimes been bent too much upon their own aggrandisement, but the people can afford to judge generously a race that has been almost constantly faithful to the cause of progress.

At the death of the last Earl his vast estates were divided. The present Earl owns 22,202 acres in Yorkshire, 308 in Derbyshire, 75 in Hunts, 89,468 in Wicklow, 1,533 in Kildare,

326 in Wexford, and 58 in Carlow—total 113,960 acres. The Hon. G. W. Fitzwilliam owns 18,116 acres in Northamptonshire, and 5,202 in Hunts—total 23,318. The total acreage owned by the two branches is, therefore, 137,278. It is worthy of note that the late Earl held no less than 31 Church livings, and though they have been divided, it is quite possible that they may be again united should either of the present branches of the family die out. The enormous amount of private patronage in the hands of the great houses is doubtless one of the causes of the aristocratic and Conservative proclivities of a large proportion of the clergy, proclivities which have tended, especially in former times, to make the Church of England the Church of a party, if not of a class. But apart from this, the aggregation of such an amount of Church patronage in the hands of one man confers upon him a dangerous amount of power. A patron of 31 livings, for instance, who inherited his property early in life, having already been converted to extreme Ritualism, if he lived to a good old age, might be able to plant, in every parish of which he held the advowson, incumbents whose views were entirely opposed to those of the great majority of their parishioners.

There is no doubt that the Fitzwilliams are of Norman blood, and that they were for centuries seated at Sprotborough, in Yorkshire, which, however, passed out of their hands about 350 years ago. All the lands now held by them have been acquired since the accession of Henry VII. As soon as the founder of a house is traced back to the days of Henry VIII., one expects to find that he acquired his wealth in a somewhat disreputable manner. Such was not the case with the Fitzwilliams. The real founder of the house was a city merchant, and the lords of Wentworth Hall need not be ashamed of the fact. The Duke of Leeds, the Earl of Northbrook, Lord Leigh, and many other nobles can trace their origin to the same source, while the Earl of Dudley and Lord Foley can go back to the time when their ancestors were humble nail-makers in Staffordshire. Moreover, the Fitzwilliam of the days of Henry VIII. was distinguished for two unusual characteristics—he bought his land with honest money, and he was not afraid nor ashamed to acknowledge and shelter a friend who had incurred the displeasure of the King. When, after Wolsey's disgrace, he entertained that prelate at his seat in Northamptonshire, and the King inquired of him how he

dared to receive such an enemy to the State, the stout old Alderman replied that Wolsey in former days had been his benefactor, and he was bound to receive him. This William Fitzwilliam was subsequently knighted and made a Privy Councillor.

We may roughly divide the Fitzwilliam estates into three portions—(1) Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire, (2) Ireland, (3) Yorkshire; the first mainly obtained by purchase, the second by confiscation, the third by marriage. Mr. J. R. Green, in his "*Short History of the English People*," brackets the family of Fitzwilliam with those of Cavendish and Russell, as having grown wealthy out of the spoils of the Church. I cannot discover why they should have been singled out. It is true that a William Fitzwilliam obtained a grant of a small monastic house in Beds value £61 annually. It is also true that a Sir William Fitzwilliam, afterwards Earl of Southampton, who was very remotely connected with the Alderman before spoken of, and who was Admiral of the Fleet, and Lord Privy Seal in the reign of Henry VIII., obtained Waverley, Chertsey, and other rich abbeys in Surrey and Sussex, but he died without heirs, and his estates passed to his nieces, and never came into the hands of the descendants of the Alderman. The large number of livings held by the Fitzwilliams is in itself suspicious, but most of these are in Yorkshire, and so came into the family not more than a hundred years ago, and the livings in Northamptonshire do not appear to have been grants from the Crown.

Alderman Fitzwilliam made large purchases of land at Milton and other places in Northamptonshire, and some of his descendants still further enlarged the family estates by subsequent purchases. Milton, Marham, Maxey, Hilpston, Woodcroft, Norborough, Deeping Gate, and other manors in Northamptonshire were thus acquired. So far as I can ascertain most of the property of the Watsons, who became earls and marquises of Rockingham, and whose possessions have been inherited by the Fitzwilliams, was obtained in like manner, though Edward Watson who lived in the time of Henry VIII. obtained a grant of the site of Shrewsbury Abbey, and of a very small monastic house at Hitchin, Herts.

The eldest son of Alderman Fitzwilliam was sent over to Ireland by Queen Mary, and became Commissioner for the Crown, and afterwards Keeper of the Great Seal. In the

reign of Elizabeth he held at various times the offices of Lord Justice, Lord Deputy, Treasurer at War, etc., and was really the English Governor of Ireland for a troublous period of nearly forty years. He took an active part in the erection of Trinity College, Dublin, to which he was a liberal contributor. The agrarian history of Ireland is simply a history of successive confiscations. With regard to Sir William Fitzwilliam, I do not care to repeat the particular statements made against him. When an historian gives no better proof of specific allegations than "he has been charged with" it is only fair to give the accused the benefit of the doubt. Yet there is too much reason to believe the general statement of Mr. Thomas Wright, that Fitzwilliam "was a man of an avaricious character, who, having formerly complained that his services were not sufficiently remunerated, determined to pay himself by the indiscriminate sale of Government offices and Government favours." Fitzwilliam's own biographer admits as much. The result was the gradual acquisition of an enormous estate in Ireland by the Fitzwilliam family.

Let us now turn to the Yorkshire estates of the Fitzwilliams, mostly situated in the neighbourhood of Wentworth Hall. The Wentworths were seated for centuries at Wentworth Hall, and from time to time increased their possessions by marriages with the Tinsley, Gascoign, Pollington, and other families. They also obtained a grant of the manor of Friar House, in Wentworth, part of the possessions of the dissolved Priory of Bolton. Sir Thomas Wentworth, the friend and co-worker of Pym, was rewarded for his apostasy from the popular cause by his elevation to the peerage under the title of Earl of Strafford. The story of the proud earl's trial and execution is too well known to need recapitulation here. The son of the first Earl of Strafford, at his death, left his possessions to his nephew, Thomas Watson, and thus the fortunes of the Wentworth family became merged for a time in those of the House of Rockingham.

The extensive manor of Ecclesall, in Yorkshire, also came to the Rockinghams by marriage. The manor originally belonged to the Crown, but was granted by James I. to Lord Sanquaire for twenty-one years on payment of £200. This was one of those scandalous beneficial leases by which James enriched his Scotch favourites out of the property of the nation. Afterwards Charles I. granted the manor, for a fee-

farm rent of £60, to a parson, who resold it to Samuel Bright, whose successor, John Bright (not an ancestor of our John Bright, I believe), was a colonel in the Parliamentary Army. He had an only daughter, whose second son inherited Ecclesall, and assumed the name of Bright. His granddaughter, on her marriage with the second and last Marquis of Rockingham, brought with her Ecclesall, and other extensive estates in Yorkshire. But they had no descendants, and the Rockingham property then reverted to Lady Anne Wentworth, aunt of the second marquis, who had married the third Earl Fitzwilliam.

The fourth earl, nephew of the Marquis of Rockingham who led the Whig party in the earlier days of George III., and who was a political pupil of Edmund Burke, seceded from Fox at the outbreak of the French Revolution, and was appointed by Pitt Viceroy of Ireland, where he was very popular; but, having given a premature promise of support to a Catholic Emancipation Bill which Pitt repudiated, he laid down his office amid the general regret of the Irish people. Henceforth he took but little active part in politics; but one deed deserves to be recorded to his lasting honour. When, in 1819, a peaceful Reform meeting at Manchester was put down by the brutal massacre which the Tories committed at Peterloo, Earl Fitzwilliam convened a county meeting to express public detestation of that wanton crime. For this act the Tory Government deprived him of his Lord-Lieutenancy of Yorkshire. His son was a worthy successor of his sire. He was not only a wise, generous, and public-spirited landlord, but he threw the whole weight of his influence on the side of popular progress. It is said that one contested election in the West Riding cost the Fitzwilliams £100,000. Under ordinary circumstances it would have been a shameful expenditure of money, but it must be remembered that the Fitzwilliams were fighting the people's battle, rather than their own, against a selfish and wealthy faction who were not ashamed to use the most unscrupulous weapons to debauch and intimidate public opinion. It is worthy of record that Earl Fitzwilliam was the first powerful nobleman to publicly give in his adhesion to the Anti-Corn Law League. When the Lennoxes and Grenvilles and Mannors were fighting desperately to maintain their iniquitous Bread-tax the Fitzwilliams freely brought their great wealth and influence to the side of the half-starved people of England, for whom most of the great houses had neither care nor pity.

The father and grandfather of the present Earl were Whigs and something more. The present Earl is a Whig and something less. Indeed, the race of Whig popular leaders appears to have almost died out. Looking at the questions which are likely to occupy the Liberal party in future, I cannot say that I view the fact with any great amount of regret.

The Bathursts.

HITHERTO I have dealt almost exclusively with great houses distinguished for their historical prominence and their immense wealth. There are others whose members have been distinguished, generation after generation, simply as place-hunters. Of this class the Bathurst family will furnish a very fair sample. Earl Bathurst is owner of 13,312 acres of land, 9,969 in Gloucestershire, and 3,343 in Derbyshire, most of which have been obtained by purchase. *Punch* once happily defined Conservative principles as the theory of taking care of the Constitution and the practice of taking care of one's self. The Bathursts have always been faithful supporters of Conservative principles.

When a family acquires an estate it can always find a pedigree. It seems strange that when a man has bought land with the proceeds of his honest trading he should think it can add to his dignity to show that he is descended from an ancestor who obtained property in a far less honourable manner. The pedigree-makers, of course, provided for the Bathursts all that they required. According to them, the Bathursts are descended from the possessors of an ancient castle of the same name in Sussex, who were of undoubted Saxon descent. We need not, however, stay to discuss whether this can be proved or no; suffice it to say that four or five hundred years ago the Bathursts were substantial tradesmen—clothiers—at Canterbury and Staplehurst. In the reign of Elizabeth, Launcelot Bathurst was a London alderman. One of his grandsons, Benjamin Bathurst, who was knighted and elected a member of Parliament, became in the reign of William III. Chairman of the East India Company, and afterwards held the office of Cofferer to Queen Anne. Sir Benjamin was the real founder of the family. He left three sons, the youngest of whom was the father of twenty-two

children by his first wife and fourteen by his second—three dozen in all.

Sir Benjamin, and his eldest son Allen, made large purchases of land in the county of Gloucester, including the Manors of North Cerney, Upper and Lower Siddington, Daglingworth, Sapperton, and Cirencester. The last purchase was important from a political point of view. It would be scarcely an exaggeration to say that the member for Cirencester is simply the member for Earl Bathurst. Until the last Reform Bill there were two seats for the borough, one of them at least being the absolute property of the family. The first Earl sat for Cirencester when he reached twenty-one years of age, and retained his seat till he was advanced to the peerage. The second Earl became member for Cirencester also at the early age of twenty-one, and retained his seat for nineteen years till he succeeded to the title. The last Earl but one sat for the borough from 1812 to 1834, when he took his seat in the House of Lords; and the Earl who has only just succeeded to the peerage has been member for Cirencester since 1857. The majority of the electors are still the political serfs of the family at Oakley Park.

Allen Bathurst, who entered the House of Commons at the age of twenty-one as a staunch Tory, obtained his peerage by the accident of a Whig majority in the Lords. In the latter part of the reign of Queen Anne the Tory party, who were anxious to stop the war in which Marlborough had won his splendid victories, had a majority in the Lower House, but a minority in the Upper, where party spirit ran to an unusual height. Harley and St. John, the Tory leaders, determined to create twelve new peers, in order to swamp the Whig majority, and Allen Bathurst was one of the number. He remained faithful to his party during the lengthened lease of power which the Whigs held during the reigns of the first two Georges. In the latter part of the reign of George II., however, the Bathursts became connected with Frederick, Prince of Wales, the Earl's son being appointed Solicitor-General, and then Attorney-General, to the Prince, and after the Prince's death he became Attorney-General to the Princess of Wales. The Earl, too, in 1757, was appointed Treasurer to her son, afterwards George III. On the accession of his master, in 1760, to the throne, the Earl was offered office, but declined on account of his age, and obtained instead a pension of

£2,000 per annum on the Irish Establishment. As he lived till 1775 he must have drawn from Irish taxes the modest little sum of £30,000.

The second Earl became Lord Chancellor in the lifetime of his father, but he owed nothing to his abilities, and almost everything to Court favour. At twenty-one he became a member of Parliament, at twenty-two he was called to the Bar; but Foss, in his "Judges of England," says that "neither as senator nor as barrister, did he hold any distinguished position." That, however, mattered but little to a Bathurst. He became the Attorney-General of Frederick, Prince of Wales, and afterwards of his widow, and was at the early age of forty promoted to a judgeship. The accession of George III. brought fresh honours to Henry Bathurst, who was at once appointed one of three Commissioners of the Great Seal, and in the following year (1771) Lord Chancellor. Incapacity could be no bar to office in a Government whose Premier was Lord North, but it was an unfortunate position for Bathurst. Foss says that "he naturally found himself in a wrong position, and it was said that he never entered his court with a firm and undaunted step. Overawed by Thurlow, Wedderburn, and other counsel practising at his bar, he was so little conversant with the principles or practice of Equity that his decisions have no value in the profession." Court favour may make a Lord Chancellor, but it has no power to make its *protégé* a legal authority. Bathurst took the title of Lord Apsley, his mother having been the heiress of that family. Having obtained an advantageous lease from the Crown, he built Apsley House at Hyde-park-corner, now the property of the Duke of Wellington. The story of the soldier's widow, who had by grant from George II. an apple-stall on this site, and whose representatives had to be compensated by Lord Apsley, gave rise to the sarcasm that he was beaten in his own court by an apple-woman. Lord Apsley resigned the Great Seal in 1778, feeling himself either mentally or physically too weak for his post; probably the former. He then held the office of President of the Council till the break-up of Lord North's administration in 1782. Though Lord Apsley was not a distinguished lawyer, he was the greatest of all the Bathursts. Considering those who went before him, and those who came after him, I am struck with profound admiration for this man. He did a deed which is unequalled in the

whole history of his house—he actually declined to receive a pension. A Bathurst refusing a pension! It is one of the most remarkable events in the annals of the last century, and, save that the fact is vouched for by several unimpeachable authorities, I should not have ventured to state it. The moderation of Lord Apsley, who subsequently became the second Earl Bathurst, was, however, fully balanced by the rapacity of his sons and grandsons.

The third Earl was altogether undistinguished as a statesman, but greatly distinguished as a placeman in successive Tory Governments. He was at various times Clerk of the Crown, Master of the Mint, President of the Board of Trade, Colonial Secretary, Lord President of the Council, a sinecure Teller of the Exchequer, Clerk of Dispensations, and I know not what besides. For some years his income from the different offices he held amounted to nearly £10,000 a year. He was quite as greedy for his family as for himself. His brother was a Joint Clerk of the Crown; his eldest son was a Commissioner of the India Board; his third son was a Lieutenant-Colonel in the army; his youngest son, who was in holy orders, was provided with one of the livings in the gift of the Lord Chancellor; his second son (the late Earl) held an office in the Victualling Department for two years; and the father having in vain sought to secure him a retiring pension for his lengthy and onerous services, forced him into the lucrative and easy office of Clerk of the Privy Council. At this period the prolific race of Bathursts swarmed in every department of the public service.

Let us take a glance at them about the year 1830. I am quite aware that my list is not exhaustive, but the facts given below will be quite sufficient. First, there was the Earl himself, who had a Tellership of the Exchequer worth £2,700 a year, and a Clerkship of the Crown in Chancery, which brought him in £1,105 more. His second son was a Deputy Teller of the Exchequer (salary £1,000 a-year) and Clerk to the Privy Council (salary £2,000). Then there was the Honourable Charles Bathurst, with an annual pension of £350 and an annual salary of £850 as Commissioner of Bankrupts and Receiver of the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster; also the Honourable S. Bathurst, Treasurer of the Government of Malta, with an annual salary of £1,560. To these must be added the Honourable Charlotte Bathurst, with an annual

pension of £900, and the Honourable Mary Bathurst, with an annual pension of £250. Nor must I forget that another Bathurst was Bishop of Norwich. Of this Bishop, of whom it was sarcastically said that "he made priests of the vilest of the people," a characteristic anecdote used to be current in the diocese, that on one occasion a youngster was taken straight out of the Navy to be put into a family living which had unexpectedly fallen vacant. The young man, attended by his father, waited upon the Bishop, who told him that the chief thing necessary was that he should be able to write a sermon. The son was quite incapable of doing anything of the kind; but the father dictated to him a discourse, which was the first and last he ever wrote. The Bishop expressed his approbation of the sermon, and the young man was duly installed into the living. What the actual value of the Bishopric of Norwich was at this time I cannot say, but the Bishop held also the Rectory of Sapperton, of which Earl Bathurst was patron. Then there was the Rev. H. Bathurst (son of the Bishop, I presume), who was not only Archdeacon of Norwich, but also held two rectories of which the Bishop was patron, worth about £1,800 a-year and a house. At this period the Bathurst family must have been in the receipt of something like £20,000 a-year of public money. No wonder that some people are Conservatives by birth!

The late Earl, whose death was reported very recently in the newspapers, was for forty-four years Clerk to the Privy Council. At his appointment the salary was £2,000 a year, but it appears to have been subsequently reduced to £1,200. On the late Earl's retirement, seventeen years ago, he received an annual pension of £1,000. I cannot but think that a sum of between £70,000 and £80,000 was slightly above the market value of the services which this nobleman rendered to his country.

The Osbornes.



EARLY in the sixteenth century the founder of the house of Osborne was a London draper's apprentice; less than two hundred years after, the head of the house of Osborne was Duke of Leeds. The present duke is owner of—

13,268	acres in	Yorkshire
5,911	„ „	Cornwall.
3,117	„ „	Bucks.
436	„ „	Cambridgeshire.

22,732 Total.

Everyone is familiar with the story of Edward Osborne, the apprentice of Sir William Hewit, the clothworker of London Bridge, who leaped into the river to save his master's daughter from drowning, and who subsequently was fitly rewarded with the young lady's hand in marriage. The brave apprentice acquired by this marriage an estate at Harthill, in Yorkshire, and certain lands in Essex which are not now in the possession of the family. Edward Osborne, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was knighted, and became Lord Mayor and Member of Parliament for the City. His son, Hewit, was also knighted, and held a military command in Ireland during the troublous times of Queen Elizabeth. Hewit's son, Edward, was a personal friend of the Earl of Strafford, and became one of the principal agents of that statesman's tyrannical misrule. He purchased certain lands at Kiveton, near Harthill, in Yorkshire, and also a small estate at Thorpe Solvin, in the same county. Up to the death of Sir Edward the landed possessions of the Osbornes were of very moderate dimensions.

The son of Edward, Sir Thomas Osborne, in the course of his life attained to the highest rank in the peerage. It is mainly on his account that I write of the Osbornes at all. He furnishes a good illustration of the manner in which the statesmen of the seventeenth century contrived to use their official

power in order to secure their own family aggrandisement. As we have seen in the history of the Russells, Cecils, Herberts, and Pagets, the rulers of England in the Reformation period carved great estates for themselves out of national property; those of the Restoration pursued the path to fortune by a yet more ignoble road. Osborne was a bitter antagonist of Lord Clarendon, and after the fall of that statesman on the formation of the Cabal Ministry, he received as his reward the lucrative office of Treasurer of the Navy. Macaulay says that "he was greedy of wealth and honours, corrupt himself, and a corrupter of others." Not long after, at the break-up of the Cabal Ministry, he was advanced to the post of Lord Treasurer, with a salary of £8,000 a year, a much larger sum in those days than in these, for at that time the average income of Peers was only £3,000 per annum. Macaulay says, however, that "the regular salary was the smallest part of the gains of the official men of that age. Titles, places, commissions, pardons were daily sold in market overt by the great dignitaries of the realm," and "the gains of Danby were certainly enormous." Honours, of course, were equally within his reach. In 1673 he became Lord Latimer, and in the following year Earl of Danby. Reluctantly he became an assenting party to the receipt of bribes by Charles II. from the King of France, but "rather than relinquish his great place he stooped to compliances which caused him bitter pain and shame," and the result was that in 1678 he was impeached, and passed five years of his life in the Tower. In this first impeachment he was charged with wasting the King's revenue and getting for himself large grants of lands and possessions of the Crown.

Danby was one of those who signed the letter of invitation to William III., and he raised Yorkshire on William's behalf. These were the most creditable acts of his life. He became one of King William's principal Ministers, and received the title of Marquis of Caermarthen, and subsequently of Duke of Leeds. Macaulay, who describes him as "a cunning old man, insatiable, ambitious, and covetous," says that there is but too strong reason to believe that he was then "accumulating unlawful gain with a rapidity unexampled even in his experience." In the year 1697 a great fraud was discovered in the Exchequer, which had been plundered by means of forged endorsements on Exchequer Bills. One of the principal culprits was Mr. C. Duncombe, Receiver-General of Excise. A Bill imposing

a fine equal to nearly half the value of Mr. Duncombe's estates passed the Commons, but was defeated in the Lords by the casting vote of the Duke of Leeds. "It was then the common report," says Parliamentary history, "that Mr. Duncombe dispelled the storm by a golden sacrifice."

The frightful prevalence of bribery, corruption, and extortion among men of the highest rank was the universal topic of complaint. Exposures were at first made of the conduct of comparatively obscure men, but these led to more important revelations. It was proved that the East India Company, fearful of losing their charter, gave to Sir Thomas Cook absolute power to expend an almost unlimited amount of money in bribes; and in a short time about £100,000 was distributed in corruption. Bates, the agent in this affair, stated before a Committee of the House of Commons that he had, by permission of Caermarthen, who had now become Duke of Leeds, left with the Duke's confidential man of business a sum of 5,500 guineas. He added that the Duke had refused to accept the money himself, but it had remained for six months in the hands of the Duke's secretary, and had only been returned on the very morning that the Committee of Investigation first met. The Duke asserted that he had only let the money remain at his house to oblige Bates; but the House of Commons, treating with proper contempt this lame story, resolved on the Duke's impeachment without a division. When they proceeded with the impeachment, it was discovered that the Duke's secretary had absconded, and, as he was an essential witness, the prosecution broke down. Well might Macaulay say that the second fall of this corrupt statesman was "ignominious and irretrievable." Though he escaped condemnation, the guilt of the Duke was universally believed, and, though William allowed him nominally to retain the office of Lord President, he was no longer allowed to take any part in public affairs. Four years afterwards he resigned his office, and, avaricious to the last, he managed to obtain a large grant of Crown lands.

In the year 1700 there was a great outcry against the grants of land made by William III. to Lord Somers and others of his ministers. The House of Commons resolved "That the procuring or passing exorbitant grants by any member of the Privy Council in this or any other former reign, to his own use or benefit, is a High Crime and Misdemeanour." Then a list of the Privy Counsellors was read out. The enemies of Somers

failed to obtain a majority in a vote of censure on him. I leave Macaulay to tell the rest of the story: "The name of the Duke of Leeds was read. He was one of themselves (the Tories). Yet how could they, just after declaiming against the Chancellor for accepting a very moderate and well-earned provision, undertake the defence of a statesman who had, out of grants, pardons, and bribes, accumulated a princely fortune? There was actually on the table of the House evidence that his Grace was receiving from the bounty of the Crown more than thrice as much as had been bestowed on Somers, and nobody could doubt that his Grace's secret gains had very far exceeded those of which there was evidence on the table."

After such a history it is almost superfluous to inquire into the manner in which the Osborne family obtained the estates which they now hold. We know that a large proportion of their broad acres was obtained by purchase, and we have seen whence the money came. We know, too, that their ancestor obtained large grants of Crown lands, and we have seen that instead of meriting such rewards, he deserved, and twice narrowly escaped, condign punishment. In 1673 he purchased the manors of Harthill and Woodhall, in 1677 that of Todwich, in 1700 that of Wakefield, and in 1701 North and South Anstan, all in Yorkshire. At the accession of William III. he procured for his son, Lord Dumblane, a pension of £500 per annum, until the office of Auditor of the Exchequer became vacant, and it was certainly more than ten years before Lord Dumblane succeeded to the post.

The Osbornes have since extended their territories both by purchase and by marriages. The fourth Duke bought the manor of Barnsley and the castle and manor of Conisborough, in Yorkshire. He also married the heiress of the Godolphin family, by whom were acquired the seat at Gogmagog Hills in Cambridgeshire and the Godolphin estates in Cornwall, which had been in the possession of that family for several centuries.

Contiguous to the Godolphin estate is the borough of Helston, which now only returns one member, but formerly returned two. From the days of Queen Elizabeth down to the beginning of the present century the Godolphins and their successors were recognised as the patrons of Helston. They regularly paid the rates of the whole parish, in consideration of which they nominated the borough members. This beautifully simple arrangement, which had lasted for two hundred

years, was broken through in 1804, when the Helstonians sold themselves to another patron, whose *régime*, however, did not last very long. In 1813 the Duke of Leeds once more entered into a corrupt bargain to pay the town rates in return for the right of nomination; in other words, he purchased two seats in the House of Commons for a sum of about £1,700 per annum. The agents in this iniquitous bargain were the local clergy, who, however, only followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, for in former times it had been part of the arrangement that the patron of the borough should find livings for such of the sons of the local clergy as chose to go into the Church. The exposure that took place was of such a flagrant character that a motion made in the House of Commons directing the Attorney-General to prosecute the ducal briber was lost by only three votes.

The estates of the Osbornes in the neighbourhood of Masham and Hornby Castle, near Bedale, in Yorkshire, were acquired by the marriage of a Duke of Leeds with the heiress of a more ancient house. These properties were long in the possession of the Dacres, Earls of Holderness, who had derived the former property from a still older family, the Coniers. They passed to the house of Osborne by the marriage of the fifth duke to the daughter of the last Earl of Holderness.

The Osbornes, since the time of the first Duke of Leeds, have not occupied a foremost position in public business. For many years past the most prominent member of the family has been the Rev. Lord Sidney Godolphin-Osborne, a Dorsetshire clergyman, who, under the signature of "S. G. O.," has, for a period of over thirty years, often pleaded in the *Times* the cause of the poor and helpless. The English peasantry, in particular, owe him a deep debt of gratitude. Long may the blessing of those who were ready to perish rest upon him! Another Rev. Lord of this family—Francis Godolphin-Osborne by name—who, had he not been a lord, would probably have been a curate all his life, was formerly an extreme Ritualist, but recently, like many of that School, he has gone over to Rome.

The Manners-Suttons.



ISCOUNT CANTERBURY is a modern title, but it belongs to an off-shoot of an old family. Of the earlier history of the Manners family I have already spoken. By the side of the Duke of Rutland, Baron Manners and Viscount Canterbury may appear quite insignificant; but the Canterbury branch of the great house is worthy of notice, because it furnishes one of the most remarkable modern instances of the way in which the dignities and emoluments of the Church of England have been used by the aristocracy. We have seen how the stones of the ancient abbey were employed to build up the house of the noble in the days of Henry and Edward; how episcopal estates were cut and carved into rewards for courtiers in the reign of Elizabeth; let us glance at the manner in which the Church has been made the nursing mother of the Peerage in more modern times. In the year 1813 I find that no less than eight English and twelve Irish archbishoprics and bishoprics were held by brothers, uncles, and cousins of peers. In the year 1833 the numbers were ten English and eleven Irish. From this it will be seen that the Archbishop, the story of whose life I am about to summarise, was not an isolated instance of good fortune, but was the representative of a somewhat numerous class.

Lord George Manners, the third son of the third Duke of Rutland, on inheriting the estates of his maternal grandfather, Robert Sutton, Lord Lexington, assumed the name of Sutton in addition to his patronymic. His fourth son, Charles, is the hero of the present story. The younger son of a younger son, he commenced life with nothing, and bequeathed, at his death, £180,000 in personal property alone. Let us see how he managed to do this. From beginning to end of his career he

“Like a great sponge sucked wealth and plenty up.”

We will begin with his boyhood. He was born in 1755, and was educated at the Charterhouse School. This noble charity

was founded for the "maintenance and education of poore children," and "the relief of poore, fatherless, decrepit, aged, sick, infirm, and impotent persons." The son of a lord, the grandson of the wealthy Duke of Rutland, was educated by displacing some poor boy from a school founded for charitable purposes. What could be expected of a boy whose very education was a robbery of the poor and fatherless? On leaving the Charterhouse he proceeded to Cambridge, and in due time took holy orders. At thirty years of age he obtained the rectory of Averham in Nottinghamshire (a living in the gift of the Suttons), whose present nominal value is £1,435, and of Whitwell, in Derbyshire, whose present value is £625. Six years afterwards he was elevated to the Deanery of Peterborough, and in the following year (1792) he became Bishop of Norwich, when he resigned his other benefices. To be promoted to a rich bishopric at the early age of thirty-seven might have satisfied most men, but Charles Manners-Sutton had the family motto in view, *Pour y parvenir*—To attain to the object—and his object was not yet attained. Two years afterwards he contrived to get hold of the Deanery of Windsor, in addition to his bishopric. His children were as yet too young to be fathered on the Church, but during his tenure of the bishopric of Norwich he presented his brother-in-law with the livings of Kessingland, £500; Lowestoft, £323; Potter Heigham, £263—£1,086 a-year in all, present value. This brother-in-law also held a prebend in Peterborough; value unknown.

Meanwhile, Sutton's position as Dean of Windsor enabled him to ingratiate himself with the King, and in 1805, in spite of the strong opposition of Pitt, George III. elevated the fortunate Charles to the archbishopric of Canterbury. To the King's favour alone he owed his elevation. As a theologian he was unknown, his printed works consisting of two solitary sermons, and a little essay on botany. Notwithstanding his rectories, deaneries, and bishopric, strange to say, when Dr. Sutton was elevated to the See of Canterbury he was overwhelmed with debt, and that in spite of having already received about a hundred thousand pounds from the Church. At fifty years of age the poor man found himself with a large family totally unprovided for. But he was now Archbishop of Canterbury, and he soon made up for lost time. "With so large an income," says the "Georgian Era," "and the purchase-money of the palace at Croydon, which he was allowed to sell by Act

of Parliament, he soon became able to discharge the whole of his liabilities." At Addington Park, which had been purchased for and conferred upon the archbishopric by the Legislature, he built an elegant mansion, and expended a considerable sum in beautifying the adjacent parish church.

Archbishop Manners-Sutton was Primate of All England from 1805 to 1828. It is impossible to state exactly what were his gains from the archbishopric during that time. We are told that by very careful management he contrived to increase its revenues. A year or two after Sutton's death Dr. Lushington gave them as £32,000 per annum. If we take the very moderate estimate of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners shortly afterwards—and it must be borne in mind that on that Commission sat the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Church dignitaries—we shall probably be pretty near the mark. Their figure is £22,216 per annum. Let us take it, including the annual value of the archiepiscopal palaces, at £23,000. It follows, then, that Archbishop Manners-Sutton, during the twenty-three years of his primacy, must have received £529,000 in money or money's worth, and £100,000 at least before he became Archbishop, making a grand total of £629,000. At his death Archbishop Manners-Sutton, who was heavily in debt at the time of his elevation to the primacy, left in personal property alone no less than £180,000.

He took care that the Church should provide for his family as well as for himself. Three of his daughters married clergymen. The fortunate suitor of the first was the Rev. Hugh Percy. The young couple were provided for by Mr. Percy's appointment in 1809 to the chancellorship of Salisbury, and to the livings of Barham, Bishopbourne, and Ivy Church. In 1816 he was presented with the prebend of Finsbury and of Canterbury. In 1822 he was also appointed archdeacon of Canterbury. He then was elevated to the See of Rochester, and afterwards to that of Carlisle, and while holding this See he contrived to retain his Finsbury prebend and Salisbury chancellorship. He died in the year 1856. I think I should not be going too far in estimating the total receipts of this son-in-law from the Church at £250,000.

Another daughter married the Rev. James Croft, who died in 1869. The Archbishop provided for him also. The *Guardian*, in noticing the death of this great pluralist, said "he had held the living of Cliffe-at-Hoo for fifty years, and that of

Saltwood for nearly sixty ; and had enjoyed his canonry (which is annexed to the archdeaconry of Canterbury) since 1824. Taking the value of his preferments at the amount set down against them in Crockford's Clerical Directory, we calculate that the Archdeacon must have received from the funds of the Church since he entered priest's orders no less a sum than £168,680." This is under the mark, because Mr. Croft at one time of his life held two other preferments. But, putting them aside, it must be borne in mind that there was a residence attached to each of his benefices. Estimating these at the moderate value of £50 a-year each, we have a magnificent total of £176,430. The history of the third clerical son-in-law I have not been able to trace. We have, then, the edifying spectacle of an Archbishop who, at his ordination, was particularly enjoined not to be covetous nor greedy of filthy lucre, and he himself and two sons-in-law between them managed to draw from the revenues of the Church certainly more than a million of money. Milton would have said of such men that they were "hireling wolves whose gospel was their maw"; but I remember what the Church was in those days, and regard them as nothing more than the natural product of a dark and evil time, which, if the Tories had had their way, would have existed until now.

But I have not yet done with Archbishop Manners-Sutton. He also provided for more distant relations while he was Archbishop. There was the Rev. T. M. Sutton, prebend of Westminster, rector of Great Chart, present annual value £621 ; and of Tunstal, £479, both in the gift of the Primate. Then there was the Rev. E. L. Sutton, rector of High Halden, £325, and vicar of St. Peter's, £560, also both in the gift of the Primate, Mr. E. L. Sutton being also one of the Six Preachers of Canterbury. Then there was a Dr. Charles Sutton, rector of Aldeburgh, £383, St. George's, Norwich, £144, and Holme, £428, the two last being in the gift of the Bishop of Norwich, which diocese Archbishop Manners-Sutton at one time held. There were other relatives provided for in similar fashion.

The crowning achievement of the Archbishop was to get an Act of Parliament passed, at the close of his life, to enable him to secure to his grandson at some future time a sinecure office of the value of about £8,500 a year. The previous Archbishop had secured to his three sons, one after the other, the Registrarship of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. When one of

these sons died Dr. Sutton wanted to nominate a third successor to the office in his place, and actually obtained a Special Private Act of Parliament to enable him to do so. The Registrar of the Court—who did no work at all, by the way—was paid by fees. Thus the dead hand was enabled to tax the living thirty years after.

The eldest son of the Archbishop was appointed Speaker of the House of Commons at a salary of £6,000 a year in 1817, and held that office till 1835, when the House refused to re-elect him, and he retired on a pension of £4,000 a year, and was created Viscount Canterbury. He died in 1845, so he must have received £148,000 for his political services. His eldest son, the second Viscount, and the one who for several years received the sinecure of between eight and nine thousand pounds per annum, through the foresight of his grandfather, did nothing remarkable, save wantonly knocking down the wife of a respectable tradesman as she was leaving the theatre one evening, for which the offender was fined five pounds at Bow-street. The present Viscount, brother of the last-mentioned, was early provided for in the Colonial Service, and has been successively Governor of Trinidad, Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and Governor of Victoria. The salary of the latter office was £10,000 per annum. Lord Canterbury is now in receipt of an annual retiring allowance of £741 13s. 4d. The Manners-Suttons do not appear to have acquired much landed property; it is to be hoped, however, that they have saved sufficient from their various lucrative offices to obviate the necessity of their posterity coming upon the rates and taxes.

The Grenbilles.

RICHARD Plantagenet Campbell Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville (the name is almost enough to take away one's breath) is certainly richer in titles than in lands. He is Duke and Marquis of Buckingham and Chandos, Earl Temple, Viscount and Baron Cobham, Earl Nugent, and Lord Kinloss. It is fortunate for R. P. C. T. N. B. C. Grenville that, being a peer, he has to sign himself simply Buckingham and Chandos; it is unfortunate for me that his multifarious patronymic indicates the confluence of so many tributary streams. There have been, at various periods of English history, so many Dukes of Buckingham that, to prevent mistakes, the present Duke, like a pushing tailor, ought to advertise, "No connection with any other house of the same name." There was Stafford Duke of Buckingham, in the days of Richard III.; Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, executed by Henry VIII.; Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of James I.; Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the courtier of Charles II.; and Sheffield, Duke of Buckingham, in the reign of Queen Anne. The present Dukedom, however, is quite a modern creation, dating no further back than 1822, though the Barony of Cobham dates from 1718. However, as the Duke of Buckingham is descended from several noble houses on the female side, he may fairly come under the category of our old nobility. For a Duke, his landed possessions are very limited.

Bucks	9,511 acres.
Cornwall	498 "
Middlesex	232 "
Oxford	236 "
Somerset	5 "
Total	10,482 "

The Duke comes of an undoubted Norman stock. In 1273 Eustace de Grenville had a grant from another Norman knight of certain lands in Wotton, Buckinghamshire, which his descendants hold to the present time. For some centuries the Grenvilles pursued the even tenor of their way as country gentlemen, taking no important part in public affairs, though, by the way, Captain Edward Grenville was a gallant lieutenant of Sir Francis Drake, and Richard Grenville commanded a troop of the Parliamentary cavalry in the Civil War, and sat for Buckinghamshire in Cromwell's Parliaments. The son of this Richard Grenville, who appears to have added to the family estates by purchase as well as marriage, wooed and won the daughter of Sir Richard Temple, who subsequently brought the estate of Stowe into the family.

The Stowe estate appears to have been spoil of the Church acquired by the Temples not at, but since, the Reformation. Stowe was monastic property down to the suppression of the religious houses, when it, with the manors of Dodford and Boycot, was annexed to the bishopric of Oxford. According to Lysons the Temples settled here in 1554, probably as lessees under the bishop. But in the second year of Queen Elizabeth the property was alienated from the See of Oxford and granted by the Queen to Thomas Compton, Robert Wright, and Gilly Merrick, who in the following year transferred it to Peter Temple. Whether this, like many similar transfers of landed property, was a mere colourable transaction, I am unable to determine. The manor of Luffield, by the way, afterwards obtained by marriage by the Grenvilles, was also originally monastic property.

The brother of Hester Temple, who married Richard Grenville, was one of Marlborough's officers, and for his military services was created Viscount Cobham. At his death his estates passed to his sister, who was created Countess Temple, with remainder to her heirs. Her daughter Hester married Pitt, "the Great Commoner," and her eldest and second sons, Earl Temple and George Grenville, took an active part in public affairs in the latter part of the reign of George II. and the earlier part of the reign of George III. Earl Temple further advanced the fortunes of the family by his marriage with a daughter and co-heir of Mr. Thomas Chamber, and also by making an allowance of £1,000 a year to his illustrious brother-in-law. In return for this favour Pitt carried the proud

Earl on his back into office as First Lord of the Admiralty, and afterwards as Lord Privy Seal.

George Grenville, whose elder brother had previously sat for the family borough of Buckingham, occupied a seat for that diminutive constituency from 1741 to 1770. Three years after his first election he became a Lord of the Admiralty, and for twenty years held various high offices in succession, including that of First Lord of the Treasury. He will chiefly be remembered as the author of the Stamp Act, which led up to the revolt of the American Colonies. Bancroft thus describes his character :—" He loved office, and loved it for its emoluments, and so inordinately that, even against the utmost endeavours of his own brothers, he had for many years cherished a rankling grudge against Pitt, because Pitt had conferred upon him the very lucrative office of Treasurer of the Navy, at a time when he himself was lusting after the still more enormously lucrative one of Paymaster to the Forces. And, in 1762, he had suffered himself to be summarily thrust out of office as Secretary of State, and had accepted another from avarice, in the hope of still higher preferment. Yet Grenville was no venal adventurer, he never made himself a broker for office, nor jobbed in lottery tickets and contracts. His desire was for solid and sure places ; a Tellership in the Exchequer, or the profits of a lighthouse, the rich sinecures which English law and English usage tolerated."

The eldest son of George Grenville succeeded to his uncle's title, and also to his uncle's overweening family pride. The former quarrelled with the King because he could not get a Garter when he wanted it, the latter because his sovereign declined to create him a Duke. He, however, obtained a Marquisate, and what was more substantial than an empty honour, one of the lucrative Tellerships in the Exchequer. By his marriage with the heiress of Earl Nugent, he succeeded to the Irish Earldom of Nugent, and the Grenvilles henceforth tacked on the name to those of Grenville and Temple. His two brothers both held office as Cabinet Ministers ; one of them also holding the lucrative post of Auditor of the Exchequer, estimated to be worth £4,000 per annum, the other a sinecure office, yielding him £2,316 annually. In 1828 Cobbett calculated in his "Register" that one of these Grenvilles had received about £170,000 of public money, while his two brothers had, agreeably to returns published by the

House of Commons, received for their sinecures not less than £700,000. Well might this family have for its motto *Templa quam dilecta*—How dear are the Temples!

The second Marquis having married the daughter and heiress of the Duke of Chandos, was raised to the Dukedom of Buckingham and Chandos, and tacked on to his other name those of Chandos and Brydges. As the lady was descended from the younger sister of Henry VIII., succeeding Grenvilles can boast that they have Royal blood in their veins. The Duke held three great and lucrative offices at various times.

His eldest son (the second Duke), when Marquis of Chandos, was the author of the "Chandos Clause" in the Reform Bill of 1832, which had the effect of transferring the balance of power in the Counties to the great landowners by the admission to the franchise of that most subservient of all classes—the tenant farmers. His two immediate predecessors, notwithstanding their various lucrative offices, had brought the house to the brink of destruction by their extravagant expenditure. The second Duke hastened the catastrophe by large purchases of land bought with borrowed money. Wherever land was to be purchased in Buckinghamshire he bought it up, regardless of the fact that the interest of the money he borrowed was much heavier than the rentals he received from the lands in question. At last his necessities obliged him to alter his course. The outlying possessions of the house were sold, as also were other portions of the estates as soon as they became free from the settlements by which they were encumbered. But all this was insufficient. At last the crash came; and, with the consent of the Marquis of Chandos (the present duke), the whole of the vast treasures of Stowe, one of the most renowned mansions in Europe, were brought to the hammer in 1848. Pictures, statuary, plate, china, wines, furniture—all went. The sale lasted forty days, and realised a sum of £75,562.

The present duke is said to have agreed that the creditors should still receive the rentals, making him an allowance of £3,000 per annum, until their claims were discharged, but creditors of the late Duke have assured me that their claims have never been paid to this day.

The Parkers.



THOUGH several of the great houses at whose history I have glanced have produced men who have risen to some of the highest legal positions, I have not yet noticed a peerage which owes its origin to the judicial eminence of its founder. Therefore I now turn my attention to the Parkers, Earls of Macclesfield. The present, the sixth earl, owns—

Oxfordshire	5,491 acres.
Staffordshire	5,482 „
Devon	2,660 „
Total							13,633

Thomas Parker, the founder of this house, was the son of a Staffordshire attorney, who brought him up to his own profession. He established himself as an attorney at Derby; but, prompted by an honourable ambition, he came up to London, and became a student of law in the Inner Temple. His rise at the Bar was unusually rapid. In 1710 Serjeant Parker distinguished himself as one of the counsel for the prosecution in the Sacheverel trial, and almost immediately after he was appointed Lord Chief Justice, an office which he held for eight years. On the death of Queen Anne, Parker became a great personal favourite with George I.; his descendants, male and female, have since his death carried on the courtier business on an extensive scale, and with very profitable results. Parker further ingratiated himself in the Monarch's regard by giving a judicial opinion in favour of his Majesty's right to control the education of his grandchildren, to the prejudice of the Prince of Wales. Two or three months afterwards Lord Cowper resigned the Great Seal, it is supposed because his sympathies were rather with the Prince than with the King. The more pliant Parker was elevated to the vacant post, and received the title of Earl of Macclesfield, making at the same time an excellent bargain for himself and his family, of which

I will speak more hereafter. Lord Campbell pronounces him to be one of the greatest Equity judges that ever sat in the Court of Chancery, but he also says that there were loud complaints of his discourtesy to some counsel and his partiality to others, which gave deep offence at the Bar and hastened his fall. He held the Great Seal for not quite seven years, and then, in 1724-5, just after the bursting of the South Sea Bubble, it began to be whispered that great frauds had been committed in the Court of Chancery. Walpole appointed a Committee of the Privy Council to investigate the matter, and Macclesfield was compelled to surrender the Great Seal. The House of Commons then resolved on his immediate impeachment, the result of which will be seen hereafter.

Let us now glance at the Earl's emoluments. It was stated in the course of the Earl's trial that his ordinary receipts from the office of Lord Chancellor were about £8,000 per annum, and between £1,000 and £1,500 per annum from the Hanaper Office. In the articles of impeachment which were exhibited by the House of Commons against Lord Macclesfield there are set forth the extraordinary emoluments he enjoyed; and the Earl, in his reply, did not call in question the truth of the statements made. First of all we are told the King did, "of his grace and bounty, bestow upon the said Earl the sum of £14,000, or some other great sum." Next that the King granted to his eldest son a yearly pension of £1,200 until he should receive a Tellership of the Exchequer, for the term of his natural life, of the value of £1,500 or upwards, which Tellership, by the way, the said eldest son obtained in 1719; and, as he lived to 1764, he must have received in pension and sinecure very nearly £100,000. Next, we are told that the Earl, during the time of his continuing Lord Chancellor, did not only enjoy the usual salary, fees, and profits belonging to his office, but also did continue to receive an annual pension of £1,200, granted in 1716 to him and his assigns during the King's life, and did likewise receive from the Crown an annual allowance of £4,000, and many other advantages. Thus the Earl of Macclesfield, besides the splendid income of a Lord Chancellor, nearly £10,000 per annum, and the provision made for his eldest son, must have received out of the taxation of the country £57,600 prior to his fall. All this was not sufficient for Lord Macclesfield, who, as the articles of impeachment declared, "not being satisfied with this large and

ample revenue, and entertaining wicked and corrupt designs and views to raise and procure to himself excessive and exorbitant gain and profits, by divers unjust and oppressive practices, did illegally, corruptly, and extorsively take and receive to his own private use great sums of money."

The chief charges made against the Earl were that he had sold Masterships in Chancery outright, or had exacted payments from Masters who had sold their offices to other persons. It was alleged that in three cases, when vacancies had occurred by death, the Earl had sold the offices for £6,000, £5,250, and £5,250, and that in five other cases, where Masters had sold their offices, the Earl had received the sum of £1,575 each from three of the new office-holders, £1,500 from a fourth, and £840 from a fifth; that he had admitted to office "persons very unfit to be trusted with the great sums of money and other effects lodged in their hands, and did publicly, in open court, falsely represent them otherwise." Further, that the prices paid for these offices "were satisfied and paid out of the money and effects of the suitors, the price and value given upon the sale of their offices being greatly advanced, the Earl being cognisant of this abuse, and by this practice great embezzlement having been made of the suitors' money and effects." Further, that Fleetwood Dormer, one of the Masters, was a defaulter for £25,000, and that, he having absconded, the Earl when applied to in order to secure Dormer, or his effects, declined, "from an apprehension that a public discovery of the said deficiency might lessen the unjust gain he proposed to make to himself, endeavouring to conceal the true position of the office from the suitors, by falsely and deceitfully declaring in Court that Dormer had only gone to take the air in the country, and would be back in a little time." Further, that the Earl compelled nine of the Masters in Chancery to pay £500 each to conceal the deficiency in Dormer's office. Further, that when a Royal inquiry was made the Earl "persuaded several of the Masters to make a false representation of their circumstances to his Majesty," some Masters supplying the others with cash to make a false show of their ability to answer the balance of their accounts. Further, that the Earl at several times borrowed and received great sums of money belonging to the suitors of his court.

There were some other charges, but I need not refer to them at length, as the Earl endeavoured to explain them

away. Those of which I have given a summary were the most serious, and were excused rather than defended by Lord Macclesfield and his counsel. The Earl admitted receiving several of the sums set out in the articles of impeachment, and in other cases disputed the correctness of the amounts; he also admitted having borrowed from one of the Masters in Chancery two sums of £1,500 and £1,000, which had been duly repaid.

After a prolonged trial, Lord Macclesfield was unanimously found guilty by the House of Lords, and was condemned to pay a fine of £30,000, and to be imprisoned in the Tower till the amount was paid. A proposition to incapacitate the Earl from ever again sitting in Parliament was defeated by a small majority, and gave occasion to a protest by 24 lords, in which they say, "We think that the sum of £30,000 does by little, if at all, exceed the gross sums this Earl hath received, as we believe, in bounties from His Majesty, over and above the due profits of his office. We are, therefore, of opinion that the infamy which is due to the crimes of which the Earl is condemned should have been fixed upon him by the disability proposed in question."

Attempts have been made to excuse Lord Macclesfield on the ground that he was to a certain extent the victim of party malevolence, but his unanimous condemnation sufficiently refutes this view. It has been urged, too, that he only did what his predecessors had done with impunity, but Lord Campbell tells us that Macclesfield's predecessor, Lord Cowper, was got rid of "from a pretended regard of his health, but from a real dislike of a Chancellor who had objected to improper grants of honours and money;" and Mr. Foss, in his "Judges of England," says that "the investigation proved that he had not been content with the accustomed *honorarium*, but had increased the price so enormously, that it became next to impossible for the appointees to refund themselves, without either extorting unnecessary fees by delaying causes before them, or using the money deposited with them to defray the sum demanded. Lord Campbell does indeed say that he was more unfortunate than criminal, and that his descendants ought to be proud of their founder; but as the same authority declares that "he was under the dominion of avarice, which drew him, as long as he could consider himself protected by existing usages, to regard the accumulation of wealth as the

great object of his existence," and that "he carried venality in the disposal of offices to a pitch before unknown," I apprehend that most people will be of a different opinion.

Lord Macclesfield remained in the Tower six weeks, till he could raise the £30,000, which was paid into the Court of Chancery for the benefit of the wronged suitors. George I. promised to repay the Earl the whole amount out of his own Privy purse as fast as he could spare it, but only £1,000 reached him.

The Stanhopes.

A *DEO ET REGE*" (From God and the King) is the motto of this fortunate family. Considering how ready the founder of the house was to despoil both, I must admit that the motto is peculiarly appropriate. The Stanhopes are a comparatively modern house—the oldest of the three peerages they possess was created in 1628. The first grant obtained by the founder of the house was in 1538. At the present time there are three earldoms—Chesterfield, Harrington, and Stanhope—held by different branches of the family. Lord Chesterfield has 8,444 acres in Nottinghamshire, and 5,209 in Derbyshire. Lord Harrington has 8,138 acres in Cheshire, 4,529 in Derbyshire, and three in Leicestershire; Lord Stanhope has 5,193 acres in Devon, 3,724 in Kent, 2,655 in Queen's County, 2,482 in Derbyshire, and 1,457 in Bucks. Total, 41,834 acres. To these must be added, Mr. W. S. Stanhope, who has 11,357 acres in Yorkshire, and Mr. J. B. Stanhope, who has 7,628 acres in Lincolnshire. All these Stanhopes are descended from a common ancestor. The total amount of their landed possessions is 60,819 acres, all acquired together with the three earldoms since 1538. The Stanhopes have pushed their fortunes well during the last 340 years; but not a few of them have done the State some service.

Michael Stanhope, the founder of the house, had to say, like Pistol—

"The world's mine oyster,
Which I with sword will open."

He appears to have begun the world with nothing, though, if the pedigree-makers are to be believed, he was the younger son of Sir Edward Stanhope, who was knighted by Henry VII. In some way or other Michael contrived to ingratiate himself with Henry VIII., and in 1538 he obtained from the King a grant of Eveshall Forest, in Nottinghamshire (my readers will

bear in mind the situation of the various estates of the family), and also of the site of the Priory of Shelton, in the same county, with 254 acres of land. Two years after he obtained a further grant of the manors of Shelford, in Notts, which consisted of nearly 2,500 acres, Elvaston and Ockbrook in Derbyshire, five rectories in Notts, and two in Lincolnshire, also lands in no less than twenty parishes in Nottinghamshire, all formerly belonging to Shelford Priory. I fail to understand why he should have obtained such an extravagant gift of lands from Henry, except it be that the brother of Queen Jane Seymour, afterwards the Protector Somerset, had married his sister. At the death of Henry, and the accession of Seymour to what was practically the Regency of the Kingdom, Stanhope became one of the Protector's chief subordinates, and was appointed a Commissioner to examine the state of the guild lands. Like all the rest of the statesmen of that time, he proved to be wanting in common honesty. On the fall of Somerset Michael Stanhope was committed to the Tower, and at his discharge he acknowledged that he *owed* the King £3,000. When a commercial traveller collects accounts and does not account for the money we call it embezzlement; but I suppose we must not apply so harsh a name to the conduct of the ancestor of three noble earls. Not very long after, Michael Stanhope lost his head on Tower-hill, and, though his trial was unfairly conducted, according to Burnet, it was generally believed at the time that he only got his deserts.

Michael's execution does not appear to have had the result of permanently alienating his possessions from the family, and one of his descendants, Sir Thomas, who was knighted by Elizabeth, still further raised the fortunes of the house by marrying an heiress, by whom he acquired the manors of Cubley and Etwell, in Derbyshire, and by purchasing the manors of Bingham, Whatton, Toveton, and Bretby, in Notts, the latter being still the principal seat of the Earls of Chesterfield. The chapelry of Bretby with its tithes was brought into the family by a lady who married one of the Chesterfields.

The grandson of Sir Thomas was the first Earl of Chesterfield, and fought for Charles I. in the Civil War. The second Earl, grandson of the first, was one of the most shameless profligates in the dissolute Court of Charles II. In his old age he rebuilt the mansion of Bretby, and added to the family estates by the purchase of Hartshorn and other properties. A

marriage with the heiress of the Dormers brought to the family considerable property in Buckinghamshire. Philip Dormer, fourth Earl of Chesterfield, is the only member of this branch of the house known to fame, and his reputation is founded neither on his career as an ambassador nor as a statesman, but upon the renowned collection of letters which he addressed to his illegitimate son, the morality of which is in inverse proportion to their elegance. Of these letters "Junius" well said that "they inculcate the morals of a strumpet with the manners of a dancing master." This Earl of Chesterfield, by the way, married Lady Walsingham, daughter of the Duchess of Kendal, who was the favourite mistress of George I. According to the present Earl Stanhope, the Duchess of Kendal was a most rapacious woman, and doubtless Lord Chesterfield found it to his advantage to be the husband of an illegitimate daughter of the King. According to Horace Walpole, George I. made a will, with large legacies, as it was believed, to both these women. George II., at his succession, took the will from the Archbishop of Canterbury and suppressed it; but as Lord Chesterfield threatened a suit in Chancery for his wife's supposed legacy, he received in lieu thereof a sum of £20,000. Of the succeeding Earls of Chesterfield there is little to be said. One of them occupied the onerous position of Master of the Horse, and another was chiefly known as an ardent supporter of the Turf.

The Earls of Harrington are descended from the half-brother of the first Earl of Chesterfield, who inherited the Manor of Elvaston, in Derbyshire, where Elvaston Castle now stands, part of the ancient possessions of Shelford Priory. One of his descendants married the co-heir of Gilbert Thacker, of Repton Priory. This famous monastery was granted to Thomas Thacker by Henry VIII., and, according to Fuller, Thacker having heard that Queen Mary was setting up the Abbeys again, collected a large body of men on a Sunday, and pulled down the beautiful church, declaring that he would destroy the nest, for fear the birds should build there again. The first Earl of Harrington was a soldier, diplomatist, and statesman of some mark, who held a succession of lucrative offices for thirty-five years. He married the heiress of the Fitton family, who was the owner of Gawsworth (at which place the Earl of Harrington now has a seat), Bosley, and other properties in Cheshire. The second Earl of Harrington distinguished him-

self as a soldier at the Battle of Fontenoy, and was well rewarded with the offices of customier and collector of the Port of Dublin, one of those well-paid sinecures of which comparatively few now remain, wherein one man received nearly all the emoluments and another did the whole of the work. The third earl, also a General, held the office of Governor of Windsor Castle. The fourth earl was a Major-General in the army, and the fifth a Colonel. This last, by the way, took part with Byron and other distinguished Englishmen in the War of Greek Independence.

The first Earl Stanhope was descended from the first Earl of Chesterfield, and played a prominent part as a soldier, diplomatist, and statesman, in the reigns of Anne and George I. He purchased the manor of Chevening, and other property in Kent, but his descendant, the historian, says that of the landed possessions which his representative now enjoys scarcely one-fifth is derived from him. The third Earl was a man of distinguished scientific attainments. The late Earl, who was formerly Under-Foreign Secretary and Secretary of the Board of Control, won for himself, as Lord Mahon, a lasting name by his historical writings.

The Stanhopes of this branch, like those of the Chesterfield and Harrington branches, have usually contrived to make some provision for their sons and daughters out of public taxation. The father of the late Earl Stanhope held the sinecure office of Keeper of the Records of Dublin Castle, salary £500 per annum, the deputy, who actually did the work, receiving only £12 per annum. One of his sisters had a pension of £900 per annum, another of £600 per annum, and the children of another sister £139 between them—in all £2,139 in sinecures and pensions held by this branch of the family. At the same period one of the Chesterfield Stanhopes held a place in the Post-office worth £1,915 annually, and another had a pension of £155; while one of the Harrington Stanhopes held two Church livings in Cornwall and two in Yorkshire, whose present respective values are £570, £250, £410, and £157—£1,387 in all. It must be admitted that the House of Stanhope has rendered good service to the country, and, at the same time, that its members have been amply rewarded.

The Montagus.



THE founder of this house was one of the most subservient creatures that ever wore judicial ermine. Henry VIII., Somerset, Northumberland, and Queen Mary all found him equally pliable. Like most of the prominent men of that time he was a greedy devourer of ecclesiastical property, including lands at Hemingford, Warkton, Barkton, Scaldwell, Houghton, Lamport, Maidwell, Hoothorpe, Clipston, and many other places, mostly in Northamptonshire. He took some part in the attempt to set the crown upon the head of Lady Jane Grey, but managed to escape with a fine, and died possessed of manors and lands in thirty-two places. Next to being a courtier, becoming a time-serving judge was in that age the short road to wealth, as Sir Edward Montagu's life shows. His eldest son had six sons, whose descendants obtained four peerages—the Dukedom of Montagu, now extinct (the lands, as I stated in a former paper, have passed to the Buccleugh family), the Earldom of Halifax, likewise extinct, the Dukedom of Manchester, and the Earldom of Sandwich.

The third son of the six, a lawyer, obtained the office of Lord Chief Justice by promising to give the post of Clerk of the King's Bench, a very lucrative office, to a nominee of Buckingham, the favourite of James I. He next bought the office of Lord Treasurer of the Duke for a sum of £20,000, though there is some doubt whether the purchase money really went into the hands of the Duke or the King. In any case, he made a bad bargain, for he was compelled to resign his office in less than two years, which looks as though both King and Duke had conspired to obtain money by false pretences. Montagu was created Viscount Mandeville, and afterwards Earl of Manchester; what he paid for his peerage I do not know, but it is notorious that nearly all the peerages of James I. were sold at a heavy price.

His eldest son was the Earl of Manchester who at one time commanded the Parliamentary Army in the Civil War. He

seems to have been a well-meaning man, possessed of no great abilities, who had to be removed from his command in order to make way for Fairfax and Cromwell, when it was found that he was incapable of pushing any advantage that had been gained by the valour of the Puritan soldiers. He occasionally took part in public affairs after this, though he had no hand in the trial and execution of King Charles. He took a share in effecting the Restoration, and to his discredit be it recorded that he also acted as one of the judges who tried the Regicides, several of whom had fought under him in days gone by.

His grandson, the fourth Earl, had an honourable part in the Revolution of 1688, and raised a body of cavalry in Huntingdonshire in support of William of Orange, by whose side he fought at Limerick and the passage of the Boyne. He subsequently represented England at several of the Courts of Europe, and at the accession of George I. he was created Duke of Manchester. There is little to be said about the first four Dukes of Manchester, save that they successively discharged the onerous duties of Lord of the Bedchamber, the great house having apparently gone permanently to sleep after obtaining the dukedom. The fourth Duke, it may be added, held in addition the equally responsible post of Master of the Horse. In the positions of Head Valet and Head Groom they could probably do little mischief beyond drawing their pay. The fifth Duke was somewhat more ambitious. He became Governor of Jamaica at a salary of about £14,000 per annum, and on his retirement obtained an annual pension of £2,000. He was afterwards Postmaster-General from 1828 to 1830. He was also for many years Collector of the Customs for the Port of London, the duties of which office were of course performed by subordinates. This office appears to have been given in perpetuity by Charles II. to a member of another branch of the family, for his services in promoting the Restoration; for the Monks and Montagus of that period were not a whit better than the St. Arnolds and Mornys of the *Coup d'Etat* of 1851. By an Act passed in the reign of George III. it was recited that the previous Duke of Manchester and his brother held the office under a promise of a renewed patent, and that the office should be held during the life of this Duke and his brother, the Treasury to nominate a deputy to perform all the duties of the office. There is some little uncertainty about the matter. Burke and other authorities credit this Duke with

holding the office, but I find in 1830 the Dowager Duchess receiving an annual compensation allowance of £2,928 for loss of the office of Collector of Customs Outwards, formerly held by the late Duke of Manchester. A few years more or less, after all, makes but little difference. In any case it was a monstrous job. What is certain is that for a number of years the Montagus received about £3,000 per annum to help them to keep up their dignity. It should not be omitted, also, that at the same time two other Montagus were provided with fat places in the Stamp Office at salaries of between one and two thousand a year each. A few years afterwards the Duke of Manchester and his relatives were dividing among them in pensions and places somewhat over £11,000 per annum.

Let us now turn to the Sandwich branch. The youngest grandson of Sir Edward Montagu purchased Hinchinbrook, the old seat of the Cromwells. His son took an active part in the Civil War as one of Cromwell's lieutenants, and, like Blake, proved himself equally well able to fight on sea as on land. At the death of the Protector he, being in command of the Fleet, made overtures to Charles II., and brought over that monarch at his Restoration; for which act of treachery to the Commonwealth he was rewarded with the Earldom of Sandwich, the place of Master of the Wardrobe for three lives, and other offices. With all his faults, he was a gallant sailor, and lost his life in a sea-fight off the Eastern Coast, mainly through the bad generalship and neglect of the Duke of York, afterwards James II. The second and third Earls were men of no particular note; the fourth became a Junior Lord of the Admiralty at twenty-two years of age, and held all kinds of offices for the succeeding forty years. His private character was most licentious, and, owing to his denunciation of Wilkes, who was one of his boon companions, he derived the nickname of "Jemmy Twitcher." Beside his family by two marriages, he had nine children by Miss Reay, the actress.

The chief distinction of this Earl was that he unwittingly afforded Erskine the opportunity of displaying for the first time his splendid oratorical powers, the very year that great advocate was called to the Bar. Captain Baillie, Lieutenant-Governor of Greenwich Hospital, after having vainly appealed to the Lords of the Admiralty for a reform of the abuses then prevalent in its administration, printed a statement of his case and circulated it among the Governors, one of the chief grievances

being that Lord Sandwich had robbed the King's worn-out sailors by placing a number of landmen in the hospital to serve his own electioneering purposes. Lord Sandwich thereupon suspended Captain Baillie, and some of the officers of the Hospital prosecuted the champion of the sailor's cause for libel. Erskine, then unknown at the Bar, delivered a powerful speech in the Captain's defence, which at once established his reputation. Towards the end of the speech Erskine said, "Lord Sandwich has, in my mind, acted such a part——" Here he was interrupted by Lord Mansfield, who reminded him that Lord Sandwich was not before the Court. "I know," replied Erskine, "that he is not before the Court; but for that very reason I will bring him before the Court. I assert that the Earl of Sandwich has but one road to escape out of this business without pollution and disgrace; and that is by publicly disavowing the acts of the prosecutors, and restoring Captain Baillie to his command. If he does this, then his offence will be no more than the too common one of having suffered his own personal interests to prevail over his public duty, in placing his voters in the hospital. But if he keeps this injured man suspended, or dares to turn that suspension into a removal, I shall then not scruple to declare him a shameless oppressor, a disgrace to his rank, and a traitor to his trust." Of the succeeding Earls of Sandwich there is nothing noteworthy to record.

The Lennoxes.



THE Dukedom of Richmond dates from the year 1675. The present Duke possesses in—

Banffshire	159,950	acres.
Aberdeen	69,960	„
Inverness	27,409	„
Elgin	12,271	„
Sussex	17,117	„
Total						286,407	„

This is somewhat extensive holding to be acquired in 200 years. As most people are aware, the first Duke of Richmond was one of the round dozen of bastard children of whom Charles II. acknowledged himself to be the father; and the “Merry Monarch,” who was mean enough to many of those who had fought for, and impoverished themselves in his father’s cause, took care to make ample provision for the children of his favourite mistresses out of the lands and revenues of the country. The mother of the first Duke of Richmond, Louise de Querouaille, a Frenchwoman, was contributed to Charles’s harem by Louis XIV., in order that she might promote the French interest at the English Court. In the infamy of her Royal lover this woman had no small share. It was during her ascendancy that Charles became the hired servant of Louis. Madam Carwell, as she was called by the English, was loaded with wealth, and was created Duchess of Portsmouth for life. Charles further procured for her from the King of France a grant of the territory of Aubigny, with remainder to her illegitimate children. Burnet says that Charles “kept her at a vast charge. She stuck firm to the French interest, and was its chief support. The King was so entirely possessed by the Duchess of Portsmouth, and so engaged by her in the French interest, that this threw him into great difficulties, and exposed him to much contempt and mistrust.”

As to the direct bribes received by Charles from Louis XIV., Burnet says :—" Lord Montagu told me . . . he believed that whatever sums came over they were only to the Duchess of Portsmouth, or to the King's privy purse, and that the French Ambassador had the sole managing of that matter."

Charles, the only son of this worthy pair, was born in 1672, and at the age of three years the King created him Duke of Richmond, at the same time making him a grant of the Castle of Richmond, in Yorkshire. A month later he created him Duke of Lennox, in the Peerage of Scotland, and bestowed upon him the great estate of Lennox, in that country. Two years afterwards King Charles granted him, by letters patent, one shilling per chaldron upon all coals shipped in the River Tyne, to be consumed in England. This monstrous grant was in force until quite a recent period. The 39th and 40th George III., c. 43, ratifies a previous agreement between the then Duke of Richmond and the Government for the purchase of the Duke's interest in this grant for an annuity of £19,000. Thus Charles II. not only gave away to bastards immense estates belonging to the Crown, but actually taxed succeeding generations for the benefit of their descendants. It is necessary to bear this in mind, because, as we shall see further on, the Dukes of Richmond have obtained large estates in Sussex by purchase, and we must distinguish between lands purchased with the fruits of honest trading and land purchased with the money acquired by an iniquitous tax on one of the prime necessities of life. The real purchaser of Goodwood was not the Duke of Richmond, but the people who had to pay an extra shilling per chaldron on their coals. It ought to be mentioned that the only time when the first Duke of Richmond distinguished himself in Parliament was in the angry debate on the Resumption Bill of 1700. Down to the time of Henry VIII. Acts of Resumption, restoring to the Crown lands which had been lavishly granted away, were passed in almost every reign, and the enormous alienations of Crown property which had taken place in the reigns of Charles II. and William III. led to a determined effort on the part of the House of Commons to pass another Act of Resumption, which was resisted by the peers, many of whom were, of course, directly interested in the matter. The cry was that the nation was being ruined by the three B's—Bishops, Bastards, and Beggars. The Resumption Bill of 1700 only applied to Dutch Beggars ; but Royal Bastards

became fearful that they might be next attacked, and the first name that appears on the protest of certain lords to the Bill in question is that of the Duke of Richmond. The first Duke purchased Goodwood, in Sussex, in the year 1720. The estates of Holmaker and West Hampnett in the same county, were bought later on in the last century.

The Dukes of Richmond have never succeeded in attaining to a position of high political eminence. They have been for the most part Whigs, and ornamental office holders. The first Duke was a Lord of the Bedchamber to George I. ; the second was a Lord of the Bedchamber, and Master of the Horse ; the third was Colonel of several regiments, Master-General of the Ordnance, and at one time even rose to the dignity of a Secretary of State. He was a somewhat eccentric politician, but he had the good sense to see the folly of prolonging the war against the revolted American Colonies, and brought forward in the House of Lords a motion for an Address to the King, begging him to withdraw his armies, and make peace with the rebellious colonists on such terms as might secure their goodwill. In 1779 the Duke actually brought forward in the House of Lords resolutions in favour of Annual Parliaments and Manhood Suffrage, and long after that time he retained his democratic opinions in favour of radical Parliamentary Reform. Yet, for all this, he was a born aristocrat, and his sneer at the lowness of Lord Thurlow's birth led to the celebrated retort from the Lord Chancellor that the duke himself was but "the accident of an accident." The fourth Duke, who also held a Colonelcy (Colonelcies, as my readers will remember, meant nothing to do and plenty to get), was at one time Viceroy of Ireland, and subsequently Governor-General of Canada. The fifth Duke served under the Duke of Wellington in the Peninsular War, and especially distinguished himself by his gallant conduct at the storming of Ciudad Rodrigo. At the Battle of Orthes he received a ball in the chest, but recovered in time to take part in the decisive struggle at Waterloo. He succeeded at the death of his maternal grandfather, the last Duke of Gordon, to the enormous estates of the Gordon family in the Highlands of Scotland, but he failed in an attempt to get back by a lawsuit the Aubigny estates, which had been alienated from his family at the time of the French Revolution. This Duke professed to be a Tory, but he quarrelled with Peel and Wellington over Catholic Emancipation, and sharing apparently in the Tory-

Radical principles of the third Duke, he took office in the Reform Ministry of Lord Grey as Postmaster-General, at a salary of £2,500 per annum. In later years he was one of the most determined supporters of the Corn Laws, and maintained a strong opposition to Free Trade long after the leaders of the Conservative Party had given up Protection as a lost cause. Strongly devoted as he was to what he regarded as the agricultural interest, there is every reason to believe that his opposition to Free Trade was as conscientious as that of Mr. Disraeli was factious. It is always easy to be wise after the event, and in regard to the Corn Laws it requires substantial proof of sincerity on the part of great Tory landowners, to warrant the belief that they were not acting from low and selfish motives. But I can come to no other conclusion than that the Duke of Richmond, mistaken as he was, was thoroughly honest in his opposition to Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel. More than once, when I have put the most favourable construction upon the conduct of a nobleman, my opinion has been called in question, and it may be so in this instance ; but, looking at the whole career of this Duke of Richmond, I can come to no other conclusion. This Duke, though not a betting man, was a great supporter of the Turf, and to him the racing fraternity owes the celebrity of the Goodwood meetings. He was a liberal and enlightened landlord ; and the present Duke has steadily followed in his father's footsteps. The Duke of Richmond, who is now Lord President of the Council, is perhaps one of the best specimens of the Conservative Dukes with which Lord Beaconsfield delights to ornament his Cabinet.

There is not one of the Dukes of Richmond that has not contrived to make some comfortable little addition to his income by means of Court appointments, ornamental Colonelcies, and other offices. Apart from the coal trade, however, they have not been particularly greedy. They have not figured conspicuously on the pension list ; even in the dark days before the Reform Bill of 1832 only two ladies of the family appear therein, with annual allowances of £445 and £150 respectively, which were held for many years.

It is worthy of notice that if the House of Lennox has not furnished any men greatly distinguished either in arms or statesmanship or diplomacy, its daughters have been the mothers of sons whose fame is world-wide. One of them who married Lord Holland became the mother of the great Whig

statesman, Charles James Fox ; another who married an Earl of Kildare was the mother of the unfortunate Lord Edward Fitzgerald, the Irish patriot ; and a third was the mother of Sir Charles James Napier, the hero of Scinde, and of Sir William Napier, the historian of the Peninsular War.

XXVIII.

The Nevills.

(ABERGAVENNY BRANCH.)

THERE are in the English Peerage houses whose energy seems to have been utterly exhausted long before the great majority of existing peerages were created. For the last three hundred years the influence of not a few great families has been freely used whether for good or evil, at almost every national crisis. Again and again they have played their part, and have staked all they possessed, either on the side of Royal prerogative or of popular liberties. The Stanleys, the Russells, the Cecils, the Montagus, the Percies, the Fitzwilliams, have constantly been to the front. There are other great houses whose history during that period has been a blank.

“ These old pheasant-lords,
These partridge-breeders of a thousand years,
Who have mildewed in their thousands, doing nothing
. Why, the greater their disgrace !
Fall back upon a name ! Rest, rot in that !
Not *keep* it noble, make it noble ! Fools,
With such a vantage-ground for nobleness ! ”

Let us take as a type of these the Nevills, and leaving the Braybrooke line for the present, confine ourselves to the Abergavenny branch.

The Nevills, who inherit by marriage a large part of the lands of the great Norman houses of Beauchamp and Fitzalan, played a prominent part during the Wars of the Roses, at which time they obtained the barony of Bergavenny, or Abergavenny, as it is now more correctly termed ; but since the second Baron fought at Tewkesbury, the history of the house (there have been nineteen barons in all) is almost as bald and uninteresting as a Biblical genealogy—Zorobabel begat Abiud, and Abiud begat Eliakim, and Eliakim begat Azor, etc., etc.

I am not aware of any distinguished Nevill since the Reformation, except Nevill the baker. The Marquis of Abergavenny is the first Marquis, fifth Earl, and nineteenth Baron. He is the owner of—

15,364	acres in	Sussex.
5,467	„ „	Kent.
2,683	„ „	Warwick.
2,639	„ „	Monmouth.
1,644	„ „	Worcester.
319	„ „	Hereford.
11	„ „	Norfolk

28,127 Total.

He also possesses the patronage of twenty-four Church livings, whose united annual value is about £9,000, twelve of them also possessing parsonage-houses.

The Nevills came in with the Conqueror, and obtained from the Norman Kings large grants of land in Durham. Richard II. created Ralph Nevill Earl of Westmorland, and his fourth son, Sir Edward, having married the daughter and sole heir of Beauchamp, Earl of Worcester, became Baron Bergavenny. From this marriage was derived the greater part of the landed property which the Nevills now hold. The title itself comes through the Beauchamps, and is the only one remaining of the numerous baronies conferred on the great Norman chieftains who conquered Wales. Soon after the Conquest one of the Norman leaders, having subdued Overwent, built a fortress at Abergavenny, or Bergavenny, as it used to be called in old English records. This border land was stubbornly contested, and the lordship of Abergavenny, after passing through various hands, came into the possession of De Braose, who, having been defeated by the Welsh chieftains, made peace with them, invited them to his castle, and then treacherously murdered them. From Braose, Abergavenny passed by marriage from one family to another till at last it came into possession of the Beauchamps, Earls of Worcester. For a time the Nevills became possessed of the title only, the Abergavenny lands passing to Nevill, Earl of Warwick, the Kingmaker, and others. In the time of Elizabeth, however, the Monmouthshire lands, having reverted to the Crown, the Nevills claimed them, and were allowed to take possession. Since that period they have held them without interruption.

The Beauchamp estates included extensive lordships and manors in the counties of Worcestershire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Hereford, Surrey, Warwick, Essex, and Kent, consisting of grants from the Crown, or derived by marriages with heiresses of Norman houses whose lands were obtained in a similar manner. Through the Beauchamps the Nevills derive Eridge Castle, near Tunbridge Wells, on the borders of Kent and Sussex, which is their principal seat. Eridge was, before the Conquest, part of the great possessions of Earl Godwin. After the Conquest it was a Royal domain, and remained in the possession of the Crown till the time of Edward III. That Monarch granted it to Hugh Despencer, and subsequently the heiress of the Despenchers married Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Worcester, whose daughter conveyed it at her marriage to the Nevills. The castle, which is a modern building, is surrounded by a park 10,000 acres in extent, from Tunbridge Wells in the direction of Rotherfield the domain being seven miles in length.

Horsfield, in his "History of Sussex," says that the Earl's manorial property extends almost without interruption hence to Lewes and Brighton, and would have been still larger, but that in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles II. divers lands in and around Rotherfield were sold to pay debts. It was not from the Despenchers, but from another Norman house, that the Nevills derived most of their Sussex property. William de Warren, son-in-law of the Conqueror, had grants of 246 lordships, according to Dugdale (298 according to Hume), and of these forty-three were in Sussex alone. The Fitzalans came into possession of the vast De Warren estates by marriage, and the last of the Fitzalans left three sisters, among whom the lands were divided, thus passing into the hands of the Howard, Sackville, and Beauchamp families. In this way were derived the lands now held by the Nevills at Lewes, Northease, Patcham, Cuckfield, and other places in the county. Kidbrooke, formerly the seat of the Nevills, was purchased in 1733, by Lord Abergavenny, he having obtained an Act of Parliament to enable him to sell part of his entailed estates in Worcestershire, and to lay out the proceeds in the purchase of land elsewhere.

The Worcestershire and Warwickshire estates of the Nevills are but a small part of the great domains formerly held by the great house of Beauchamp. This family formerly held half

the manor of Kidderminster, which originally was granted by one of the Norman Kings to the Bissets. An heiress of the Bissets conveyed it to the Beauchamps, but this property, together with other lands in the neighbourhood, was sold to the first Lord Foley.

The Manor of Birling, in Kent, also came to the Nevills through the Beauchamps. This was part of the vast estates of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, half-brother of the Conqueror. After passing through various hands, in the reign of Henry VI. it came into the possession of the Beauchamp barons, though by what means I cannot ascertain. The property was augmented in the usual manner in the reign of Henry VIII. At that time Lord Abergavenny was possessed of 150 acres of land, then inclosed in the park of Birling, and also of the rectory of Birling, and all tithes and tenths belonging to it and the advowson of the vicarage, all these late belonging to the abbot and convent Bermondsey.

The fifteenth Baron Abergavenny was advanced to the dignity of an Earl in 1784. As there were eighteen family livings (there are twenty-four now) his second son went into Holy Orders, and two of his grandsons by the second son, all of them of course being duly provided for. The second Earl, at some time in the reign of George III., was appointed to the office of Inspector of Prosecutions in the Customs. In 1812 this office was abolished as a sinecure, and to the noble Earl was awarded a sum of £1,545 annually for the loss of an office in which he had nothing to do but to take his salary. The Earl lived thirty-one years after the office was abolished, so he must have taken considerably over £50,000 out of the taxes without having rendered any service to the country whatever. A proper man to have for a family motto, "Incline to nothing base." The first son of this Earl died young; the second died in the prime of life, a captain in the Navy; the third son, of course, was in Holy Orders; and held the Rectory of Burgh Apton, Norfolk, present value £573 and a house, and the Rectory of Otley, Suffolk, value £670, and a house. The fourth son, also in Holy Orders, held the Rectory of Frant, Sussex, value £705, with a house, and the Vicarage of Birling, Kent, value £364. All these, I need hardly add, were family livings. (A brother-in-law of the present Marquis, by the way, is Vicar of Birling at the present time.) Thus we have the heir of the great house of Nevill, the owner of nearly 28,000

acres, with his two youngest sons receiving at one time from the funds of the Church and the State a comfortable sum of over £3,800 per annum and the life tenancy of three good houses. For the last thirty years I believe the Nevills have managed to eke out a living without applying for out-door relief.

The Cavendishes.



THREE hundred and fifty years ago the head of the house of Cavendish was an obscure Suffolk squire; at the present time his descendants hold three peerages and 220,385 acres of land in England and Ireland—rental £172,099. The estates of the Duke of Devonshire extend into 14 different counties:—

Derby	83,829 acres.
York	19,333 „
Lancashire	12,681 „
Sussex	11,062 „
Somerset	3,014 „
Lincoln	1,392 „
Cumberland	983 „
Middlesex	524 „
Notts	125 „
Chester	21 „
Stafford	28 „
Cork	32,776 „
Waterford	27,540 „
Tipperary	9 „

In all 193,322 acres. The Duke has also the patronage of 42 Church livings, whose united annual value is considerably over £10,000 per annum, and of these it should be noted that 23 are vicarages. The Duke also possesses seven seats—Chatsworth, Hardwick, Holker, Compton Place, Bolton Abbey, Lismore Castle, and Devonshire House, Piccadilly. Lord Waterpark, an illegitimate offshoot from the Cavendishes, owns 8,550 acres in Derbyshire and Tipperary. Lord Chesham, a Cavendish who was created a peer in 1858, owns 11,486 acres, distributed over half-a-dozen counties. The Honourable Richard Cavendish owns 7,027 acres in Bucks, Stafford, and Denbigh.

The founder of the house was William Cavendish, who has been commonly supposed to be identical with that Cavendish

who wrote the "Life of Wolsey," and who has been immortalised by Shakespeare. The probability is that Wolsey's Cavendish was George, the brother of William. William Cavendish, a small landowner in Suffolk, was one of the Commissioners for taking the surrender of the Religious Houses under Henry VIII. He subsequently held the offices of Auditor of the Court of Augmentations and Treasurer of the Chamber to the King. In the year 1540 he received a grant of the lordships and manors of Northawe, Childewicke, and Cuffley in Hertfordshire, all monastic property. The direct grants made by the Monarch by no means cover the nefarious transactions of that reign in Church lands. Then and in the succeeding reigns grants were made to various individuals who almost immediately parted with the estates in question, on exceedingly advantageous terms, to the officials concerned in the transaction. A profitable business was also done in exchanges. Cavendish, in the last year of the reign of Edward VI., exchanged the manors of Northawe (Herts), Northawberry (Lincoln), the site of Cardigan Priory, and lands in Cornwall and other counties—all of which had been acquired by him during his tenure of the various offices he held—for an extensive grant from the Crown of "divers lands belonging to abbeyes and priories in Derby, Notts, Stafford, Dorset, Cornwell, Kent, and Essex." Cavendish, being only an agrarian Protestant, the accession of Mary did not affect him; he held the same office under her as under her predecessor.

His third wife was Bess of Hardwicke, a Derbyshire widow who had persuaded her first husband to leave her all his property. Under her influence he sold his estates in the Southern counties and purchased lands contiguous to her own property, her brother as well as her former husband having left her his estates. This grasping woman, who had a family by Cavendish, after his death married Sir William St. Loe, stipulating that in default of children by the marriage, his estates should go to her, thus robbing his daughters to advance the fortunes of the house of Cavendish. After St. Loe's death she married a fourth time, her last husband being the Earl of Shrewsbury, with whom she made another hard bargain. She married her daughter to Shrewsbury's son, and her eldest son to Shrewsbury's daughter. This woman was a great constructor of houses as well as of matches, and built the former Chatsworth House, Oldcotts, and Hardwicke Hall.

William Cavendish's eldest son died early, and the second son inherited most of the family estates. Welbeck Abbey, however, passed to the third son, whose heir was the famous Marquis of Newcastle, of the Civil War, in which, according to the Marchioness, he lost nearly a million of money. Even after it was over he had £22,390 a-year left, partly derived from his ancestral estates, and partly from the lands of the Ogles, whose heiress he had married. As he left no male heirs his lands passed, by successive marriages, to the Holles and Bentinck families. The second son of William Cavendish and Bess of Hardwicke was created Baron Cavendish, and afterwards Earl of Devonshire, in the reign of James I. The second Earl, who died at Devonshire House, where Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate, now stands, seriously embarrassed himself by extravagant expenditure, but the house had recovered from its difficulties by the time that his heir came of age. The fourth Earl was the most distinguished member of the house. Hitherto the Cavendishes had been nothing more than supple, self-seeking courtiers, or supporters of regal tyranny; henceforth they were destined to play a nobler part in history. The fourth Earl, in the lifetime of his father, was the friend and ally of Sydney and Russell; he appeared as a witness for the latter at his trial, and even offered to change clothes with him in order to effect his escape. He stoutly supported the Exclusion Bill, and afterwards became the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. Having been grossly insulted in the Court of James II., he struck his antagonist, and by the vile Judges of that period was fined the enormous sum of £30,000. In vain bonds for £60,000, lent by the Cavendishes to Charles I. and II., in the days of their adversity, were offered in payment; the King insisted on taking a bond for the amount, which I am glad to say was never paid, William III. soon after cancelling it. The Earl of Devonshire was one of those who corresponded with the Prince of Orange and invited him over. He risked his life and estate by raising his tenantry in Derbyshire in support of William, and, undeterred by the cowardice of the men of Derby, he marched on to Nottingham. William III. created him Duke of Devonshire, and if ever a dukedom was fairly won by patriotic and courageous conduct it was his.

Of the two succeeding Dukes there is little to be said. Like most of the great Whig nobles, they held Court appoint-

ments, the first being President of the Council, and the second Lord Steward of the Household, and subsequently Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. The fourth Duke successively held office as Master of the Horse, Lord High Treasurer of Ireland, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and subsequently First Lord of the Treasury. He was not a man of distinguished abilities ; but he had the merit of incurring the hatred of Bute, the Princess Dowager of Wales, and King George III. This Duke married one of the richest heiresses of the time, whose broad acres largely increased the rent-roll of the house of Cavendish. The lady in question, only daughter of the Earl of Burlington and Cork, was, indeed, the heiress of two great families—the Cliffords and the Boyles. From the Cliffords are derived the Yorkshire estates in Wharfedale and Airedale. The manor of Skipton was granted by the Crown to this family in the reign of Edward II. The manor and chase of Barden, 3,232 acres, for a long time passed into other hands, but subsequently were again united to the Clifford property. The far-famed Bolton Abbey was granted by Henry VIII. to Clifford, Earl of Cumberland. Beside the Yorkshire estates, the Cavendishes derive a portion of their Cumberland property from the Cliffords, the remainder having been obtained by purchase. Considering the extent of the Cumberland property purchased by one of the Dukes of Devonshire from the Bentincks, I am surprised that they appear to own so little in that county. The Irish estates were brought into the family by the same heiress. In the reign of Elizabeth occurred a scandalous transaction in Church lands, by which the Archbishop of Cashel granted the manor of Lismore and other lands to Sir Walter Raleigh, who subsequently sold them to the Boyles. Chiswick House, too, was included in this lady's inheritance, it having been acquired by purchase by the Earl of Burlington and Cork. The manor of Sutton, in Chiswick, is attached to the Deanery of St. Paul's ; a lease of it was granted to Lord Burlington, which has been renewed from time to time to his heirs, until quite recently, at any rate.

The younger son of this fourth Duke, from whom the present Duke is descended, married the only daughter of the Earl of Northampton, who brought into the family the Sussex estates. The honour of Pevensey was a Royal grant to Bentinck, Earl of Portland, who sold it to Spencer Compton, an ancestor of the Earl of Northampton. The Eastbourne property, which of

late years has become very valuable, was also acquired by purchase from the Comptons.

The fifth Duke took no active part in politics; his sole claim to distinction is that he was the husband of the Duchess whose portrait was painted by Gainsborough, and who bought a vote with a kiss from a Westminster butcher. The sixth Duke, who never married, by the help of Sir Joseph Paxton made Chatsworth and Chiswick famous for their horticultural magnificence. At his death the vast possessions of the Cavendishes, Hardwicks, Boyles, Cliffords, and Spencer-Comptons became united by the accession of the Earl of Burlington, now the Seventh Duke of Devonshire. The Lancashire estates round Holker Hall, on the northern side of Morecambe Bay, though chiefly composed of monastic lands, appear to have been acquired by the Cavendishes in a legitimate manner. Furness Abbey was granted in the reign of James I. to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, who shortly afterwards sold the property to the Prestons. Cartmel Priory, not far distant from Furness, was granted by James I. to the Earl of Haddington, one of his Scotch favourites, who also sold it to the Prestons. An heiress of the Prestons married Sir William Lowther, who, dying without issue, left his estates to his cousin Cavendish.

The seat of Lord Waterpark, Doveridge, in Derbyshire, was a portion of the spoil of the religious houses granted to William Cavendish. He obtained a grant of the lands of Tutbury Abbey in Staffordshire, which included Doveridge. The greater part of Lord Waterpark's property is, however, situated in Ireland, and was acquired by the marriage of one of his ancestors with the heiress of Sir H. Pyne, of Waterpark, in that country. It is worthy of note that Lord Waterpark, though coming of a family who spent their fortunes and lives in defence of Charles I., is also descended from John Bradshaw, who presided at the trial of that misguided Monarch. The estates of Lord Chesham, brother of the Duke of Devonshire, at Chesham and Amersham in Bucks, and elsewhere, have mostly been obtained by purchase.

The Cavendishes have the reputation of being good landlords; and the Duke who made Chatsworth one of the marvels of the country was always glad to afford the toiling masses in the towns an opportunity of sharing in the pleasures derived from his unequalled gardens. Whatever may be our opinions as to the disadvantages to the nation of enormous accu-

mulations of landed estates, it must be admitted that the Cavendishes have generally acted upon the principle that property has duties as well as rights, and have more than once rendered valuable service to the popular cause. If the Marquis of Hartington would only sometimes forget the family motto, *Cavendo tutus*—Safe by being cautious—he might, perhaps, accomplish as much for the welfare of the people as the best of his ancestors.

The Scotts of Eldon.



THE recent presentation of the address to Earl Russell has recalled the attention of many men to the battles that were fought half a century ago. One of the chief opponents of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was the Earl of Eldon. We are threatened with all kinds of revivals just now, religious, architectural, literary, and political, especially the last. The known opinions of Lord Beaconsfield threaten us with a revival of personal government. The despatch of Indian troops to Europe threatens a return to those glorious days when the backs of Englishmen were hacked to pieces under a guard of Hessian mercenaries. Why should we not have a revival of Eldon Toryism?

The present Earl of Eldon owns—

11,841	acres in	Durham.
6,869	„	Dorset.
6,664	„	Gloucestershire.
387	„	Surrey.

25,761 acres ;—rental £28,200.

I know nothing of the few acres in Surrey ; the Gloucestershire estates were left in reversion to the second Earl by Lord Stowell, brother of the first Earl. The major portion of the Durham and Dorset estates was purchased by the first Earl in his lifetime. The first Earl began life with £4,000, and if he had devoted the whole of his professional income as a barrister to the purchase of land, he would hardly have been able to acquire the estates he bought during his life. At his death he was worth half a million in hard cash. So he must have derived more than that amount from his long tenure of judicial office. With half a million of money for his reward, he ought to have done something for his country—and he did much. The Tories of the present time are sadly degenerated, but as they are led by the avowed admirer of

Bolingbroke and "the King's Friends," it is possible that they may be stirred to emulation by the illustrious example of Lord Eldon.

John Scott was the son of a Newcastle coal-merchant, and commenced life by making a runaway match with the daughter of a Newcastle banker. He was called to the Bar, and at first was rather unsuccessful, his first important stroke of business being to make two hundred guineas as a paid agitator at a Newcastle election. For a time he quietly devoted himself to his profession, but in 1783, by the favour of Lord Weymouth, he entered the House of Commons as the member for the rotten borough of Weobly, in Herefordshire, as one of "The King's Friends." Although he was previously utterly unknown in the place, a letter of introduction from his Lordship was quite enough. Once in the House, he went in for office; but as he made a ridiculous speech on Fox's East India Bill, he was for a time disappointed. However, he managed to ingratiate himself with Lord Thurlow, and was made Chancellor of the County Palatine of Durham. In 1788 he obtained his reward as a supporter of Pitt by being appointed Solicitor-General; and having attained that office, he had the audacity to tell the King that he lost £2,000 a year through it, though his own fee-book proves that his professional income increased by £1,000 a year on his acceptance of office. Not very long after he became Attorney-General.

As Attorney-General, his first exploit was the prosecution of a solicitor who, when intoxicated, had uttered some seditious words in a coffee-house, and whom he had the pleasure of seeing sentenced to six months' imprisonment, to stand in the pillory, and to be struck off the rolls. His next great work was the prosecution of Thomas Hardy, a Radical shoemaker, the Secretary of the Corresponding Society whose object was a Reform of Parliament. In a speech of nine hours he sought, by straining the law of constructive treason, to bring this man to the gallows, in which attempt he failed to break down the prejudices of the Jury. Undaunted by the failure of a prosecution in which he had attempted to make Hardy responsible for words spoken when he was hundreds of miles away, he began another treason prosecution against the learned and witty John Horne Tooke. On this and other occasions he wept in the course of his speech. Readers of Shelley will recollect the lines—

"His big tears, for he wept well,
Turned to millstones as they fell,
And the little children, who
Round his feet played to and fro,
Thinking every tear a gem,
Had their brains dashed out by them."

In repelling the attacks made upon him for his share in the prosecution he declared that he could endure anything but an attack upon his good name; it was the little patrimony he had to leave to his children. Then he shed his crocodile tears, and the Solicitor-General sobbed in company. "What is Mitford crying for?" asked a bystander of Horne Tooke. "Oh," replied the witty parson, "he is crying to think what a small patrimony Sir John Scott's children will have to divide between them." The Jury returned a verdict of not guilty in Tooke's case, and also in Thelwall's, and then Scott had to abandon the remaining prosecutions. Scott had worked hard in these treason cases to bring these patriots to the gallows. He had told the Jury that the members of the Corresponding Society had illegally armed and clandestinely drilled, but he had not a tittle of evidence to produce for the assertion; and though he tried his best to hang these men, he himself afterwards admitted that the evidence was so nicely balanced that if he had been on the Jury he should not have known what verdict to give.

In the House of Commons he pursued an equally ignoble course. He brought in Bills to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, to interfere with the right of petitioning, and to prohibit public meetings of more than fifty persons. He himself boasted that in two years there had been more prosecutions for libel than in any twenty years previously. His next exploit was to obtain a sentence of fine and imprisonment against the proprietor of the *Courier*, for saying that the Emperor of Russia was rendering himself obnoxious to his subjects by various acts of tyranny. I cannot help thinking that it is well that Scott is not now the Attorney-General, otherwise certain organs of the War Party would have a rather unpleasant time of it. He greatly distinguished himself in a large number of libel cases, and had the unspeakable pleasure of sending a clergyman to gaol for two years for the offence of publishing a political pamphlet.


In 1799 he was appointed Chief Justice of the Common

Pleas, and in 1801 he attained the summit of his ambition and became Lord Chancellor. In that capacity he distinguished himself by his successful resistance to all reforms. He succeeded in throwing out the Bill for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, and also in thwarting those who desired to abolish the punishment of death for stealing goods to the value of 5s. from a dwelling-house. Then he made a noble and successful resistance to Lord Holland's Bill for the Establishment of Parochial Schools, and to the Bill for prohibiting the grant of offices in reversion—he had good reason in the latter case, for he soon after appointed his own son to the reversion of two lucrative offices. I might give a lengthy list of the measures of reform which Lord Eldon lent all his strength to oppose; suffice it to say, in the language of Lord Campbell, that “he defended every abuse and absurdity which disgraced our jurisprudence.” He not only defended the Manchester Massacre, where some half-dozen persons were killed and seventy wounded by the soldiery for attending a peaceable Reform Meeting, but he tried to induce his colleagues to prosecute the prisoners for high treason, and, in conjunction with his illustrious colleagues, Sidmouth and Castlereagh, he passed the Six Acts, by which for a time every right of remonstrance against tyranny was suppressed. His conduct to Queen Caroline was worthy of a man who clung with desperate tenacity to office. In the time of George III. he was one of Caroline's friends, and was frequently a guest at her house. When he became Chancellor to George IV., he tried his utmost to damage the Queen, and to induce the Lords to pass the Bill of Pains and Penalties. In all he held the office of Lord Chancellor for about a quarter of a century, and during the latter part of that time the block of business in his Court became such a public scandal that Joseph Hume protested “that the greatest curse that ever fell on any nation was having such a Chancellor and such a Court of Chancery.” By order of the House of Commons an awfully voluminous list of all the cases heard by Eldon for eighteen years in which judgment had not been pronounced, was printed and laid on the table. Year after year the suitors waited for decisions in vain, some of them, it was said, dying in poverty and despair, because this man who was paid nearly £20,000 a year to dispense justice would neither work himself nor introduce such a reform into his Court as would clear off the arrears.

When he was set free from office he continued the same consistent course. From 1828 to 1834 there was not a measure of reform or of humanity which he did not encounter with the most strenuous opposition,—the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts and Catholic Emancipation in particular. On one division in Committee on the latter Bill, the House of Lords was almost evenly divided. Lord Byron happening to come in, Eldon caught sight of him. “D—— them,” exclaimed this pious defender of the Church, “they’ll have it now. By G——, the vote that has just come in will give it them;” and then he pathetically declared that “if the Bill passed the Sun of Great Britain would set for ever.” The Reform Bill of 1832 of course encountered the strongest opposition from him, and he told the Lords, if the Bill passed, Monarchy could not exist in the country. Again and again he resisted all relaxation of the bloody code which sentenced men to be hanged for theft. He resisted the abolition of the Corn Laws, and the establishment of County Courts, and the Municipal Reform Bill. He denounced the Whig Government for not violently suppressing Trades Unions altogether, and the very last speech he made in the House of Lords was against the Bill authorising the Great Western Railway—railways being, as he told the Peers, dangerous innovations.

More than once during the latter part of his tenure of office he was fiercely attacked, and being personally very sensitive, he attempted to reply to his assailants, but, as Lord Campbell says, on such occasions “he did not consider himself bound to adhere rigidly to Cocker. Indeed, he had the effrontery to declare that he was a loser by holding the Great Seal, but the average amount he received when Attorney-General was only £10,000 per annum, according to his own fee-book, while, according to his own statement, his official income as Lord Chancellor exceeded £17,000 a year net, and in one year reached as high a figure as £22,730. Nor was this all. His second son, the Hon. W. H. J. Scott, was appointed by him to four offices connected with the Court of Chancery, mostly sinecures, to say nothing of the reversion of two others. From these offices alone, his son, who died in 1832, must have received in the course of his lifetime nearly £37,000.

The Seymours.

N writing of the Seymours I limit myself to the branch of that great family represented by the Marquis of Hertford, for it has pleased the other branch to revert to that which they believe to be the ancient and correct spelling of their patronymic—St. Maur. The Seymours profess to have come over from St. Maur, in Normandy, which is probable enough, though by no means certain. The first that we know of them is that rather less than 200 years after the Norman conquest the Earl of Pembroke assisted William St. Maur in forcibly stealing from a Welsh chief the manor of Undy, or Woundy, in Monmouthshire, where there is a church dedicated to St. Maur. For a few generations the family retained this name, but towards the end of the fifteenth century it became altered to Seymour. Since that time the name of Seymour has so often occupied such a great place in English history, that it seems a strange freak of fancy that the proud Dukes of Somerset should revert to the ancient spelling of Norman knights and Welsh borderers, of whom everything is forgotten save the name. It is not only pardonable, but natural, that a Snook should wish to change his name to Mortimer, or a Bugg to Norfolk-Howard, but a man with the name of Seymour might be not only contented, but even proud thereof.

In the reign of Edward III. one of the Seymours married the co-heiress of John Beauchamp, through which alliance considerable estates, principally in the West of England, came into the possession of the family, and not very long after the old seat at Undy was sold. In the reign of Henry VIII. Sir John Seymour was successively Sheriff of Dorset, Somerset, and Wilts. His daughter Jane became the third wife of Henry, and mother of King Edward VI. Through this marriage the Seymour family rose for a time to a position of extraordinary power, but into their history I will enter more fully when I speak of the Dukes of Somerset. The lands in

the possession of the Marquis of Hertford were mostly derived not from the Seymours, but from the Conways. The Marquis of Hertford is the owner of

10,281 acres in Warwickshire.

59,741 „ „ Antrim.

3,524 „ „ Down.

73,546 acres ;—rental £91,511.

his seat being at Ragley, near Alcester, in Warwickshire.

In the reign of Charles II., Sir Edward Seymour, a violent Tory, moved the impeachment of the Earl of Clarendon, and was afterwards elected Speaker of the House of Commons. Throughout the reigns of Charles II., James II., William III., and Anne, he was one of the most conspicuous members of the House. Though he joined William soon after his landing, his loyalty to that monarch was for some time very doubtful. Macaulay says that “he was licentious, profane, corrupt ; too proud to behave with common politeness, but not too proud to pocket illicit gain.” Amongst other similar transactions, he received a bribe of several thousands from the East India Company, as did also the Duke of Leeds and other prominent statesmen. From the issue of Sir Edward’s first marriage the present Duke of Somerset is descended ; from the issue of the second the Earl of Hertford. Popham Seymour, the eldest son of the second marriage, was a young man of extremely dissolute life, to whom his cousin, the last Earl of Conway, had bequeathed his extensive estates, worth some £7,000 a year, a large property considering that at that time, according to Macaulay, the average income of English peers was not half that amount. At twenty-four years of age Popham Seymour was mortally wounded in a duel with Colonel Kirk, and the Conway estates passed to his next brother, Francis.

The Conways were a family of no great note till the time of Elizabeth. In her reign one of them who was knighted, and who filled various offices, purchased the manor of Ragley, in Warwickshire, the present seat of the Marquis of Hertford ; another married a lady who brought into the family the manor of Arrow, which is in the vicinity of Ragley. Sir Edward Conway, son of the purchaser of Ragley, became Secretary of State to James I., and from that monarch and his son Charles he obtained large grants of confiscated estates in the North of Ireland, in and around the town of Lisburn.

Francis Seymour, who inherited the Conway estates, was created Baron Conway, and his eldest son was advanced in 1793 to the dignity of Marquis of Hertford. General Conway, brother of the first Marquis, was a man of considerable ability, and distinguished himself both as a soldier and a politician. A well-meaning but somewhat weak and irresolute man, he was hardly fitted to occupy the positions he filled in the earlier part of the reign of George III. Of him Bancroft says that "he was so fond of doing right that the time for doing it passed before he could come to the conclusion what it was, and the man who was appointed to guide the mind of the House of Commons never knew how to make up his own."

The second Marquis, who held the office of Lord Chamberlain of the Household, married for his second wife the daughter and co-heir of the last Viscount Irvine, who brought for a time the estate and mansion of Temple Newsam, near Leeds, into the Seymour family. Of him there is little to be said, but readers of Tom Moore will remember the imaginary Epistle of the Prince Regent to the Earl of Yarmouth, son of the Marquis, in "The Twopenny Post Bag," in which occurs the following passage:—

"Our next round of toasts was a fancy quite new,
For we drank, and you'll own 'twas benevolent, too,
To those well-meaning husbands, cits, parsons, or peers,
Whom we've any time honoured by courting their dears;
This museum of wittols was comical rather,
Old H——t drank M——y, and I drank your father."

This Lord Yarmouth, afterwards the third Marquis, who was a particular friend of the Prince Regent, and a man of the most licentious character, illustrates the worst side of high life during the period in which he lived. There are only too many indications that the present generation is beginning to be cursed with the same curse. His wife, Maria Fagniani, was said to have had three fathers, one of whom, the Duke of Queensberry ("Old Q."), evidently considered that he had the most valid, if not the most legitimate claim, for at his death he bequeathed to her and her husband a sum of £150,000, two houses in Piccadilly, and a third at Richmond. The lady followed the evil example of her husband, and the chief among her favoured lovers was Marshal Junot. The Marquis, being the particular friend of the Prince Regent, became the

fortunate holder of quite a number of public offices. He was Vice-Chamberlain, Lord Warden of the Stannaries, Lord Steward and Vice-Admiral of the Duchy of Cornwall, Chief Commissioner of the Duchy, and even Recorder of Coventry and Bodmin until the reform of the municipal corporations. All was fish that came to the capacious net of "the Marquis with the Red Whiskers." Of him, during his father's lifetime, Tom Moore wrote one of his stinging epigrams, in the shape of a dialogue between a dowager and her maid on the night of Lord Yarmouth's *fête*:—

" 'I want the Court Guide,' said my lady, 'to look
If the House, Seymour Place, be at 30 or 20 ;'
'We've lost the Court Guide, ma'am, but here's the Red Book,
Where you'll find, I daresay, *Seymour Places* in plenty.' "

This illustrious ornament of the aristocracy appears, indeed, to have quartered the whole tribe of his relations upon the public revenue. There were Seymour Places in plenty in those days. The Seymours figured in every capacity, from ambassadors to wharfingers, and from serjeants-at-arms to housekeepers. To say nothing of those who held offices in the Army and Navy, one drew £2,000 a year as chairman of the Excise Board, another £1,909 as Secretary of the Turkish Embassy, another £1,100 as a Commissioner of Portsmouth dockyard, another was Serjeant-at-Arms to the House of Lords, another was Serjeant-at-Arms to the House of Commons, another was an Equerry to the King, another was Ambassador at Florence, two others were Clerks of the Crown to the King's Bench in Ireland, another was housekeeper at Hampton Court, another was housekeeper at Somerset House, another was chamber-keeper in one of the palaces, and two others received £1,250 a year as compensation for loss of office as carmen and wharfingers to the port of Dublin. It was computed about fifty years ago that the relations of this noble Marquis drew about £23,000 annually from the resources of the country, independent of the amount which he drew himself.

The Marchioness—I am obliged to say the Marchioness, in order to be strictly accurate—had two sons, the elder of whom succeeded to the family titles and estates. He resided most of his life in Paris, and at his death a large portion of his property passed to his natural son, Sir Richard Wallace, Bart., M.P. for Lisburn, who owns 11,223 acres in Suffolk, 58,365 in

Antrim, and 2,693 in Down, and who bears the reputation of being a good landlord. The title and the remainder of the estates passed to the great-grandson of the first Marquis, who was formerly groom-in-waiting to the Queen. He holds the pleasant and easy office of Lord Chamberlain, for which he receives a salary of £2,000 per annum, in addition to £456 per annum as a retired lieutenant-general in the Army. He has a daughter a maid-of-honour at the Court, with a salary of £300 a year; and two distant relatives, one of whom has a yearly allowance of £1,300 as a retired ambassador, and has already received £37,700; the other, who has a pension of £264, has, up to the present time, received £4,755. His eldest son is one of the Conservative members for South Warwickshire.

The Vane-Tempests.

WHAT an entertaining sight it would have been could one but have watched the Great Asian Mystery when he was writing out his telegram after he had received the result of the County Down election. I can imagine the sly chuckle, the knowing wink, the thrusting of the tongue into the cheek, as he wrote of the encouragement which the County Down electors had afforded him. Of course he knew perfectly well that he might as reasonably have addressed his telegram to the 23,389 acres of land owned by the Marquis of Londonderry in County Down as to the 6,076 electors who voted for the Marquis's son, Lord Castlereagh. I am not surprised at the return of the young gentleman; I only wonder that any man could be found bold enough to contest the seat against him. A seat for County Down has been almost as uninterruptedly at the command of the Londonderry family as the mansion at Mount Stewart. The first Marquis sat for the county till he was elevated to an Irish peerage; his eldest son, the Viscount Castlereagh who engineered the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland, was returned for it at the mature age of twenty-three. He appears to have had some difficulty in winning the election, as he had to spend £30,000 in order to gain it; but the experience he acquired in profuse expenditure enabled him to manipulate the last Irish Parliament in a manner that has become historical. Castlereagh's father died, and he became Marquis of Londonderry, but being only an Irish peer he continued to hold a seat in the House of Commons. The third Marquis had already obtained an English peerage in 1814, so he did not require the seat; but the fourth Marquis was at one time member for County Down, and now the eldest son of the fifth Marquis holds the same position. This young man, twenty-six years of age, of course owes his membership of the House of Commons to the fact that he is Viscount Castlereagh; he needs some compensation for the hard necessity of having to

bear a title of such evil repute. Perhaps he does not object to it ; for my part, I would almost as soon be called Caligula or Judas Iscariot.

The landed possessions of the Marquis of Londonderry, whose rental is £ 91,899, are as follows :—

Down	23,389	acres.
Durham	12,821	"
Montgomery	7,399	"
Merioneth	2,685	"
Londonderry	1,922	"
Donegal	1,702	"
Total	49,918	"

The Landowners' Return also credits the Marchioness with 11,560 acres in Antrim. Whether that refers to the late or the present Marchioness I am not quite certain. However, this last item brings the total up to 61,478 acres. The ancestors of the Marquis of Londonderry were the Stewarts, Lords of Ochiltrie, in Scotland. In the reign of James I., Lord Ochiltrie having become greatly impoverished by his extravagance, received from the King an Irish Peerage and a large grant of forfeited estates in Ireland. As the great estates of the various Scotch settlers in Ireland were derived from confiscation, we need not inquire further into the particular circumstances. The third Lord Castlereagh, half-brother of *the* Lord Castlereagh, who succeeded that statesman in the family title and estates, was a companion in arms of the Duke of Wellington during the Peninsular War. He married as his second wife the daughter and heir of Sir Henry Vane-Tempest, a ward in Chancery, who was the owner of great estates in the county of Durham and elsewhere. This was the Marquis (at the time Lord Stewart) of whom Moore sarcastically wrote :—

“And 'tis plain when a wealthy young lady so mad is,
Or any young lady can go so astray
As to marry old dandies that might be their daddies,
The stars are in fault, my Lord Stewart, not they.”

The Vanes have for centuries held considerable property in Durham, and the Tempests had also acquired much land, chiefly by purchase, in the same county. The estates at Wynyard, near Stockton, Long Newton, Swainston, Elstob, Stainton, Old Durham, and other places, passed by the mar-

riage of the Vane-Tempests into the hands of the Stewarts, who subsequently adopted the surname of Vane-Tempest.

Lord Castlereagh, the colleague of Eldon and Sidmouth, commenced his career in the Irish House of Commons as a Reformer. In fact, like the present Viscount, he was ready to give any number of pledges in order to ensure success. He impudently broke his written pledge and received his reward. First he was made Privy Seal, then a Lord of the Treasury, then Irish Secretary. By the most shameless bribery and corruption he succeeded in procuring the assent of the Irish House of Commons to the Act of Union. Of the baseness of his conduct in that matter he stands self-condemned, for in one of his own private letters he speaks of "the profligacy of the means by which the Union has been accomplished." His reward for this transaction was the Presidency of the Board of Control, and subsequently the Secretaryship for War. At the War Department he projected and carried out the disastrous and disgraceful Walcheren expedition, which was in its conception, in its management, and in the appointment of its commanders, a proof of its author's utter incapacity. Forty thousand soldiers were landed on the swamps at the mouth of the Scheldt, where, before long, nearly the whole number were seized with fever, hundreds dying every week. Nearly half the force was dead or missing on the return of the expedition, upon which it was said that £26,000,000 were expended. A man who was responsible for such a disaster, if he had not been utterly shameless, would have retired into private life. Not so Lord Castlereagh. Two or three years after (1812) he was appointed Foreign Secretary, a post which he held till his death in 1822. He was one of the chief promoters of "The Holy Alliance," entered into by the despots of Europe for the suppression of all liberty on the Continent, and at home he was one of the chief promoters of the gagging and coercion Bills by which the Tories of that day sought to stifle the cry for reform. Twice he narrowly escaped the censure of the House of Commons for corrupt transactions—once for bartering an Indian writership for a seat in the House of Commons which a friend of his wished to obtain, and once for procuring a seat for another friend of his, and then endeavouring to influence his vote against Queen Caroline. As a speaker he was the butt of all the wits of the time. Who does not remember Byron's scathing description: "That monstrous hieroglyphic,

that long spout of blood and water, leaden Castlereagh"? and Moore's stinging epigram:—

“Why is a pump like Viscount Castlereagh?
Because it is an empty thing of wood,
That up and down its awkward arm doth sway,
And coolly spouts, and spouts, and spouts away,
In one weak, washy, everlasting flood”?

“It is the first time since the Normans,” wrote Byron, “that England has been insulted by a Minister who could not speak English, and that Parliament permitted itself to be dictated to in the language of Mrs. Malaprop.” I have not space here to detail the shameful story of the Castlereagh-Eldon-Sidmouth Administration, the worst Government probably that England has ever known since the days of the Stuarts; but in 1822 the end came so far as Lord Castlereagh was concerned. He was preparing for his mission to Verona, where he was to meet the European despots, to assist them in forging fresh chains for their unhappy peoples. As Miss Martineau says, “His passage thither was sure to be attended by the curses of all the lovers of freedom along the road, and by the groans of all the Secret Societies over which he was to ride rough-shod,” when, to the intense relief of England and Europe, at length it was announced that he had cut his throat. At this distance of time there seems something brutal in the joy with which the intelligence of his suicide was received, and that not by the masses of the people alone. The crowd that assembled at his funeral gave a great shout of delight that was heard through Westminster Abbey while the service proceeded; but even Lord Byron wrote four epigrams on the event, one of which ran:—

“So Castlereagh has cut his throat!—The worst
Of this is—that his own was not the first.”

One almost shudders at this exhibition of feeling; but how great must have been the execration in which the man was held to have made it possible. Even so calm a historian as Miss Martineau says:—“There was abundant reason for the rejoicing which spread throughout the world on the death of Lord Londonderry. When a man's acts have proved him the enemy of his race, his race will not desire him to live that he shall continue those acts. This man was the screw by which

England had riveted the chains of nations. The screw was drawn, and the immovable despotism might now be overthrown."

The third Marquis, after the final overthrow of Napoleon had closed his career as a soldier, turned his attention to diplomacy, in which he was not remarkably successful. However, he was for some time the British Ambassador at Berlin and at Vienna, and, according to Lord Dudley and Ward, who was at one time Foreign Secretary, he had received in ten years for his public services £160,000. Not satisfied with that sum, his Lordship had the coolness to apply for a pension—an application which the Tory Premier, Lord Liverpool, endorsed with the significant comment, "This is too bad." Some time after, when the Duke of Wellington was for a short time in office, it was proposed to send him as Ambassador to St. Petersburg, with a salary and allowance of £15,000 a-year. The appointment was attacked so vigorously in the House of Commons by Mr. Sheil and Mr. Hume that the Marquis, who had denounced Polish patriots as rebels, stayed at home. This Marquis was one of the most violent opponents of the first Reform Bill. Twice he was assailed by the mob, and on the second occasion he pulled out a pistol, and would have fired it if he had not been prevented by a friend. It was calculated, a few years afterwards, that he and his relatives were in the receipt of £11,100 a-year in places and pensions. This noble specimen of the aristocracy was not too much of a gentleman to refrain from beating one of his own maid-servants. The Durham estates of the Vane-Tempests have grown so rapidly in value, owing to the industry of the people of Durham, that of late years they have not been reduced to the hard necessity of supplementing their income out of public taxation.

The Percies.



HERE is scarcely a house among our older nobility that has a fairer record than the Percies. The common people—the hand-workers and brain-workers—who create all the wealth that Nature does not provide, have at least a right to ask of the few that take toll of the many for the right to live and work—what have you done with the wealth which has been showered upon you? Some of our ancient families could give but a sorry answer. They can boast that their ancestors came over with the Conqueror, and they can boast of nothing else. They have held their estates, and regularly received the rents of them, for centuries, but the History of England knows nothing of them. The industry of England has fed and clothed and housed them generation after generation, and in return they have done—Nothing. There are others whose names are of evil repute, and of whom it might be said, in spite of all Royal patents—

“Their ancient but ignoble blood
Has flowed through scoundrels ever since the Flood.”

The Percies have been far otherwise. Of course, when I speak of the Percies I mean the successive heirs of the Percy estates. In point of fact, the Dukes of Northumberland are not Percies. For a hundred years the Percies were a great Norman house, who, by the way, held not a foot of land in the county of Northumberland, and then the heiress of the family married a Louvain. For five hundred years the Louvain-Percies played a prominent part in English history, and then the heiress of the second line carried the estates to the Seymours. For a brief space the two great houses were united, and then the heiress of the Seymour-Louvain-Percies carried the major part of the estates to the Smithsons, a family of Yorkshire squires who had obtained a baronetcy as a reward for espousing the Royalist cause.

When they were once settled in Northumberland, the Percies, from their very position, had to hold their own by the sword. They proved themselves valiant leaders in the continual conflicts with the Scots. Herein, perhaps, they merit no especial praise. In most of the wars between the two nations, as also in the smaller conflicts between the borderers on each side, the blame may be fairly divided. Suffice it to say that, whatever grants the Percies may have at various times obtained from the English monarchs, they had to fight to maintain their possessions; and they did fight gallantly. The fame of the great House of Northumberland, however, rests upon a far more solid basis. At the time of the signing of Magna Charta we find the head of the Percies ranged on the side of the patriotic Barons; and subsequently he was one of the twenty-five guardians of that celebrated pact between the people and the King. Moreover, he had the further honour of being excommunicated by the Pope. The next heir but one was a supporter of the same cause in the long and troublous reign of Henry III. The next was among those who withstood Piers Gaveston, the unworthy favourite of Edward II., as also was his son, who fought on the renowned field of Crecy. The next was a staunch supporter of John Wycliff, the first apostle of the Reformation. This Earl of Northumberland was the one who figures so prominently in Shakespeare's *Richard II.* and *Henry IV.* His son was the Harry Hotspur whom our great dramatist represents as killed by Prince Henry—afterwards Henry V.—at Shrewsbury, and impudently claimed as vanquished and slain by Falstaff. The old Earl was afterwards killed and his head set upon a pole on London Bridge; but Henry V. restored his grandson, who fell fighting for the Lancastrian cause at St. Albans. His eldest son, faithful to the House of Lancaster, was slain at the great battle of Towton, and his three brothers also lost their lives in the same cause. The next heir was restored to his estates by Edward IV.; but he contributed to the downfall of Richard III. by withdrawing his forces at Bosworth. His elder grandson died without children, and the younger, taking part in the Pilgrimage of Grace, was executed, and the whole family was attainted. For a time John Dudley, the Duke of Northumberland of Edward VI.—who was unconnected with the Percies—obtained the vast estates; but after his death Mary restored them to a nephew of the last Earl. This Earl, a Catholic, was

unjustly imprisoned by James I. for fifteen years in the Tower of London. The next Earl espoused the popular side in the Civil War, and though he had no part in the death of Charles I., he remained faithful to the Commonwealth during Cromwell's occupation of power. At the Restoration he endeavoured to secure guarantees for Constitutional Government from Charles II., and to prevent the execution of the late King's judges. The son of this Earl left only a daughter, who married the Duke of Somerset, and conveyed to him the Northumberland estates. This Duke proved faithful to the Percy traditions by welcoming the Prince of Orange to England. His son left but a daughter, who married Sir Hugh Smithson, afterwards first Duke of Northumberland. From this brief outline of the history of the family it will be seen that the people of England owe them not a little. As opponents of John and Henry III. and Richard III., and as supporters of Wycliff and the Long Parliament and the Revolution, the Percies, down to the great Settlement of 1688, showed that they were the leaders rather than the oppressors of the people. In the North they have always been a popular house, and certainly it must be admitted that their popularity was well deserved.

The Duke of Northumberland owns in

Northumberland . . .	181,616 acres . . .	£161,874 rental.
Surrey	3,765 „ . . .	6,698 „

besides some smaller properties in Durham and Middlesex. His chief seats are Alnwick Castle in Northumberland, and Sion House, near Isleworth, Middlesex. The Surrey estates are derived from the marriage of the present Duke with the daughter and heiress of the late Mr. Henry Drummond, M.P., of Albury, in that county. The Northumberland estates have been derived partly by royal grants, partly by marriage, and partly by purchase. The barony of Alnwick, which had formerly belonged to the De Vesci family, had been given by the last De Vesci who held it to the Bishop of Durham about the close of the thirteenth century; in 1309, ten years after, the Bishop sold the barony to Lord Percy. Not very long afterwards the head of the great house obtained, by grant from Edward III., Backworth, Beanley, Ackington, Cosbridge, Newburn, and other places in its vicinity, most of which manors had been forfeited by the Earl of March through his rebellion. The

barony of Prudhoe, with other estates appertaining thereto, came into the Percy family through a marriage with the heiress of the Earl of Angus. Soon after the dissolution of the monastic houses the immense possessions of Tynemouth Priory, consisting of twenty-seven vils, with their royalties, besides lands, houses, tithes, and appropriations in a large number of parishes, were granted to, or rather seized by, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. After his execution these possessions reverted to the Crown, but the Percies seem to have since obtained a considerable portion of them. The Percies have since largely added to their estates by purchase—Elsdon, Coquet Island, Mickley, Earsdon, Buckworth, and a portion of Alnwick having been obtained in that manner. The Percies also formerly held extensive estates at Petworth, in Sussex, and in Cumberland; but these were separated from the rest at the death of the Duke of Somerset, when they passed to the Wyndhams.

Alnwick Castle, “the Windsor of the North,” was rebuilt by the first Duke about the middle of the last century, and it has since been restored and beautified at great cost by his successors. Sion House, Isleworth, was one of the numerous pieces of ecclesiastical plunder obtained by Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, and which afterwards reverted to the Crown. In 1604 James I. granted this place, with the manor of Isleworth, to the Earl of Northumberland and his heirs for ever. Northumberland House, Charing-cross, recently pulled down, stood on the site of the Priory of St. Mary Rouncival, which was granted in the reign of Edward VI. to Sir Thomas Cawarden. By what means it passed into the hands of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton, I cannot discover; but as that nobleman was notoriously poor until the death of Elizabeth, and came into possession of the site in the reign of James I., I have little doubt that it had reverted to the King, and was granted by him to Northampton. Northampton, who was a pander to Carr, the King’s favourite, who dabbled in monopolies, and at length contrived to obtain a pension of £3,000 per annum from King James, built Northumberland House—“it was supposed with Spanish gold,” says Banks, in his “Dormant and Extinct Baronage.” Northampton, dying without children, left this property to the Earl of Suffolk, whose daughter married the Earl of Northumberland, and thus brought the estate into the family. The first offer to purchase was refused by the

present Duke, who, however, accepted the second offer, in the year when his leases of the neighbouring houses ran out; so that he obtained the whole of the purchase-money—£500,000.

By most of its possessors the vast wealth of the Percy family has been wisely used. The first Duke, the first restorer of Alnwick, also rebuilt Sion House, and planted annually more than a million of trees on his Northumberland estates. The third duke was Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, where he was very popular, and on his ancestral domains benevolent even to a fault; but his public usefulness was hindered by a strange and painful malady from which he suffered. The most distinguished of the family, however, was the fourth duke, who died in 1865. It was computed that in the seventeen years during which he held the dukedom he expended £39,600 in roads and bridges, £176,000 in drainage, £100,000 on churches, £250,000 in beautifying Alnwick Castle, and £308,000 in building cottages, to most of which was attached half an acre of land. He had been a captain in the navy, and was a man of simple habits, whose personal expenditure was of the most modest dimensions, and when he came into possession of his enormous wealth his chief study was to discover how best to use it. He was a munificent patron of art, and brought over a number of Italian art-workmen to finish the decorations of Alnwick, which place he made quite an Art school for England, by placing there a number of promising lads, sons of farmers and labourers, as pupils of the foreign artificers. His munificence was also exhibited in the construction of lifeboat stations on the stormy Northumbrian coast, and in many other public works. It is said that when the Sailors' Home at North Shields was projected he not only gave the site, but when asked for a donation to the building quietly and unostentatiously defrayed the whole cost. The full extent of his wise and judicious benevolence will never be known, for he was one of those men who "do good by stealth and blush to find it fame."

As a rule the Percies have not figured largely as placemen or pensioners, though there have been a few exceptions. The career of that distinguished Pluralist, Hugh Percy, Bishop of Carlisle, brother of the fifth Duke, I have already alluded to when sketching the history of the Manners-Suttons. A third brother, the Hon. Algernon Percy, drew the modest sum of £2,900 a-year as Ambassador to Switzerland, and a fourth

brother drew £1,400 a-year as Commissioner of Excise. The Hon. A. Percy, an offshoot of this family, has 7,363 acres of land in Yorkshire, Shropshire, and Lincolnshire; and the Dowager Duchess also has 5,083 acres in Yorkshire.

The fourth duke was succeeded by his cousin, the aged Earl of Beverley, who only enjoyed the Northumberland title and estates for two years, when his son, the present duke, came into possession. Whether in time to come it can be recorded that the Beverley line of Percies have maintained the public spirit and princely usefulness of the ancient House is somewhat doubtful.

The Amhersts.

LOOKING into the history of the Percies I had occasion to trace the career of that Right Reverend pluralist, Hugh Percy, Bishop of Carlisle, who, as I estimated previously, must, in the course of his lifetime, have received about £250,000 from the Church, to say nothing of the fat canonries, prebends, and rectories of his son and sons-in-law. I find that one of the Bishop's daughters married Earl Amherst. I have often noticed the tendency of families who receive large sums of money for doing little or nothing to intermarry; here is a case in point. Three generations are represented by Archbishop Manners-Sutton, Bishop Percy, and Earl Amherst. Earl Amherst is not a very large landed proprietor. He owns—

4,269	acres	in	Kent.
1,789	„	„	Warwickshire.
741	„	„	Essex.
<hr/>			
6,799	Total.		

Though his Kentish estate is valuable he cannot be a wealthy Peer, but he contrives to eke out a living by the help of a pension of £3,000 annually from the taxes. During the seventy-four years that the Amhersts have received this handsome allowance they have obtained in all £222,000. Whatever may have been the services rendered by the first Lord Amherst to his country, it is high time that this pension ceased. The offices which the first Lord Amherst held during his lifetime were lucrative enough to enable him to support a peerage, and the present race of Amhersts are not descended from him, but from his nephew. It is bad enough that Parliaments of borough-mongers and aristocratic nominees should have had such loose notions of morality that they did not scruple to saddle upon us the expenses of the wars which they waged on behalf of narrow national jealousies and Continental absolutism.

But the money was actually advanced, and we cannot and ought not to shake off the liability. But what right has any Parliament to tax posterity to all time by means of these hereditary pensions, and to condemn noble and wealthy families like the Churchills and the Amhersts to the perpetual receipt of outdoor relief? The first Lord Amherst was well paid, or paid himself, in his lifetime for his public services, and I am inclined to think that the pension was not granted for military conquests at all, as his exploits in Canada were ended by the year 1763, and the pension was not granted for many years afterwards. The pension of which I am speaking was granted in the year 1803, and Jeffrey, first Lord Amherst, died in 1797. I have met with a statement that the said pension was really the purchase-money of certain lands in Canada which had been granted to the first Lord Amherst. If this be true, the land should have been bought outright for a lump sum. In any case, whether the pension was granted to the nephew in consideration of his uncle's victories, or whether it was simply the purchase-money of the lands in Canada which the nephew had inherited, after the nation has paid £222,000 it is quite time that the annual payment should be commuted.

Jeffrey, first Lord Amherst, obtained a peerage just over a hundred years ago. It is said that when Lord George Sackville solicited a peerage, on his resignation of office, he asked that he might be created a viscount, because, if called to the House of Lords as a baron only, his secretary, Lord Walsingham; his lawyer, Lord Londesborough; and his father's page, Lord Amherst, would take precedence of him, the latter, as Lord George stated, having often ridden on the braces of his father's coach, when, as Viceroy, he was conveyed to the Irish House of Lords. Lest this story should inspire the vain ambition of some boy in buttons, I must explain that Jeffrey Amherst's service in the Sackville family was not at all likely to have been of a menial character, inasmuch as he was the son of a Bencher of Gray's-inn, who had acquired from his father—who probably had purchased it—a small estate at Riverhead, near Sevenoaks, in Kent. Jeffrey Amherst soon after entered the Army, and became an aide-de-camp to Lord Ligonier, who commanded the English Army at Dettingen. He subsequently was aide-de-camp to the Duke of Cumberland, the Butcher of Culloden, and in process of time became major-general. The elder Pitt, who had a keen eye for officers of capacity selected him to

command the land forces in the expedition to Canada, the naval command being entrusted to Admiral Boscawen. Amherst succeeded in capturing Louisburgh, and a subordinate commander, General Wolf, having captured Quebec, in the attack on which he fell mortally wounded, Amherst followed up these successes by a series of exploits in which he succeeded in wresting Canada from France altogether. Five years after his departure, in 1763, he returned to England, and was then appointed Governor of Virginia, of which office he was deprived in 1768. "The Government of Virginia," says the Duke of Grafton in his memoirs, "had, according to former practice, been granted to Sir Jeffrey Amherst as a military sinecure, to be held in London. But the troubled state of that province would no longer admit of a non-resident Governor, and its Assembly, while voting the salary, had made complaint that they received no service in return. With the unanimous consent of the Cabinet, Amherst was informed that the King must call upon him to resign his post, but was willing to grant him an adequate pension until another appointment of the same value could be found for him. Sir Jeffrey, however, proved intractable, and refused all terms." So that, until even a Tory Government was so ashamed of the job that they had to put an end to it, Sir Jeffrey was actually receiving a handsome salary by the vote of the Virginian Assembly from the taxes paid by the colonists, while he remained at home and did nothing in return for the money which they paid him. At the end of the same year, however, Sir Jeffrey received a sinecure colonelcy, in addition to the one he had previously held. In 1770 he was appointed Governor of Guernsey, in 1772 Lieutenant-General of Ordnance and Commander-in-Chief, which offices he held for ten years, during which time he obtained a peerage. He was also Gold Stick-in-Waiting to George III. In 1793 he again became Commander-in-Chief, but two years after had to make way for the Duke of York, and he then retired from public life. He died childless, and the barony of Amherst was entailed upon his nephew.

The second Lord Amherst, after having held a diplomatic appointment in Italy, was sent on an Embassy to China in 1817; but his mission proved abortive, owing to his refusal to prostrate himself before the Celestial Monarch. In 1823 he went out to India, just at the outbreak of the Burmese War, and was rewarded with an Earldom for his services during his

five years' tenure of office. He was afterwards a Lord of the Bedchamber, at a salary of £800 a year, and subsequently Viceroy of Canada. Neither in China, India, nor Canada did he prove himself a particularly successful statesman. The third Lord, second and present Earl, in course of time succeeded his father, and has been content with the family pension. His son, Viscount Holmesdale, one of the Conservative members for Mid-Kent, was formerly a Captain in the Guards, served with distinction through the Crimean War, and was severely wounded at the battle of Inkerman. He has three brothers in the Army.

As I previously intimated, the father of the first Lord Amherst had acquired a small estate near Sevenoaks; the son extended its boundaries by the purchase of the third part of the manor of Otford and other lands. He also pulled down the old house and built himself a mansion, which he called Montreal, in commemoration of his chief victory, enclosing certain common land, with the consent of the lord of the manor, to enlarge his grounds. He also acquired a piece of land at Riverhead, formerly belonging to Henry Smith's Charity, giving in lieu thereof a rent-charge on one of his farms, of the same amount as the rent he formerly paid for Smith's land. It was only a small transaction, but it was one of many others by which noble landowners secured without payment the future unearned increase of Charity estates. Lord Amherst also acquired by purchase lands at Yeldham in Essex. His nephew, the second lord, married the daughter and co-heir of the last Lord Archer, by which alliance the estates at Tanworth, and other places in Warwickshire, came into the possession of the Amherst family.

The Hobarts.



LOOKING over the posthumous memoirs of Sir Nathaniel Wraxall in order to verify a statement in regard to the Percies, I found that when speaking of the Percies, he remarks that the Burrells, a connection of the Percies, did not owe their peerage to female charms, as did the Hobarts and the Conynghams at a more recent period. By this statement I am reminded that I have not yet glanced at a class of peerages which derive their origin from the peculiar circumstance alluded to by Sir Nathaniel Wraxall. I have spoken of the Lennoxes and the Fitzroys, but there is a distinction to be drawn between the peerages which monarchs have created for the benefit of the children who, not being legitimate, were not born princes, and the peerages which monarchs created in order to gratify the caprice or ambition of the ladies whom they regarded with peculiar favour. The Hobarts will serve as a type of the latter class.

Although the Hobarts owe their peerage to a not very creditable circumstance in the history of their house, they may yet hold their heads high, for they can proudly boast that the blood of John Hampden flows in their veins, a distinction which some of the noblest houses in the land might well envy. Moreover, they inherit the possessions of the illustrious patriot. Anyone who has ever travelled to Aylesbury by that delightful Great Western route must have noticed, when passing Risborough, a range of hills, the most prominent feature on which is a large white cross, where the chalk is kept bare of turf. A walk over that range of hills brings the traveller to Great Hampden, the home of the illustrious patriot, though the mansion itself has been rebuilt since his time. The place is now the seat of the Earl of Buckinghamshire. The male line of the Hampdens, of which, after the death of the great Puritan leader, the less said the better, died out in 1754, and the estates passed by a daughter of the house to the Trevors. The third and last Viscount Trevor died in 1824, and the

estates of the Hampdens then passed to the Hobarts, who were descended from John Hampden's youngest daughter.

The Hobarts were originally a Norfolk family. Henry Hobart, who followed the legal profession, became Attorney-General to James I., and was one of the first baronets created by that monarch. Sir Miles Hobart was elected member for Great Marlow, and took an active part in the struggle against royal despotism in the earlier part of the reign of Charles I. Everyone will remember that memorable scene in 1629, when the Speaker of the House of Commons, having signified that he had received a Royal order to adjourn, was forcibly held down in his chair, while the door was locked against the King's messenger, and at the instigation of Eliot the Commons resolved that whoever should bring in innovations in religion, or whatever Minister advised the levy of subsidies not granted in Parliament, should be declared a capital enemy to the Kingdom and Commonwealth, and every subject voluntarily complying with illegal acts and demands should be declared a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy of the same. The sturdy Puritan who locked the door was Sir Miles Hobart, for which offence he was afterwards summoned before the Court of Star Chamber and committed for two years a close prisoner to the Tower. It is no small honour to belong to a family a member of which was the friend of Hampden and the sharer of Eliot's captivity. Sir Miles died through an accident not long afterwards. Another Hobart married the youngest daughter of John Hampden. Their son married the granddaughter of Serjeant Maynard, another patriotic leader, who in his prime had taken part in the impeachment of Strafford, and lived in extreme old age to congratulate William III. on his accession. This lady brought with her the manor of Milton Keynes and other estates in Buckinghamshire and elsewhere, though most of them seem to have subsequently been sold out of the possession of the Hobarts. It would, perhaps, have been well if the history of the Hobarts had ended at this point. No title could add to the honour of a family which could boast amongst its ancestors such men as John Hampden, Miles Hobart, and John Maynard. But I must proceed to tell the story of its decadence into an earldom.

One son and three daughters were the issue of the marriage last referred to. The eldest of the daughters, whose praises were sung by Swift and Pope, married Charles Howard, after-

wards Earl of Suffolk. She became one of the Bedchamber Women to the Princess of Wales, afterwards Queen Caroline; to the husband of Caroline, George II., she stood in a still closer relationship. Strange to say, she continued to hold her office at Court, and was treated by the good-natured Queen with marked consideration, and even friendship, Her Majesty even addressing her as her "sister Howard." The position of Lady Suffolk was exceedingly advantageous to her brother, who successively held office as Commissioner of Trade and Plantations, Treasurer of His Majesty's Chamber, and Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners. He was also created a Privy Councillor, Baron Hobart, and subsequently Earl of Buckinghamshire.

The fortunes of the Hobarts, however, do not appear to have increased in proportion to their advancement in rank, as almost every one of them since the period of their elevation seems to have sought such employment as it was not beneath the dignity of a noble family to accept. The second Earl became Comptroller of the King's Household, Ambassador to Russia, and Viceroy of Ireland. He married a co-heir of Sir Thomas Drury, but, dying without male children, he was succeeded by his brother, who had married the co-heir of Lord Vere Bertie. This nobleman was Secretary to the Russian Embassy, a place secured for him probably by his brother, the Russian Ambassador. Diplomacy, however, was not the only occupation open to the Hobarts. The Church has received distinguished services from them, or perhaps more accurately I might say that they have derived substantial benefits from the Church. The younger brother of the third Earl, who for many years received a handsome salary as Chairman of the House of Commons Committee of Ways and Means, and who on his retirement enjoyed a pension of £300 a-year, had a son who, entering into Holy Orders, obtained a Canonry at Hereford, worth about £1,000 a-year, and the Rectory of Bere Ferris, in Devonshire, value £700 a-year and a house. A son of this same Earl was Dean of Windsor and Chancellor of the Order of the Garter, say £3,000 a year for the two offices; Rector of Haseley, £728 and a house; Vicar of Nocton, £854 and a house; and Vicar of Wantage, £503 and a house; Hanley and Wantage being livings in the gift of the Dean and Chapter of Windsor. By the side of this magnificent plural Dean, the clerical emoluments of another

brother, the present Earl, dwindle into insignificance. He was formerly Rector and Prebend of Wolverhampton. The present value of the rectory is £750 a-year and a house, that of the prebend is merely nominal.

About half a century ago it was estimated that the uncles, cousins, sons, brothers, brothers-in-law, and other connections of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, including an illegitimate offshoot of the family, who enjoyed a fat sinecure of £1,400 a-year, were receiving in all nearly £63,000 of public money annually. Well might they say, in the words of the family motto, "Our footsteps are all advancing." Those were halcyon days for noble families of moderate fortune, when promotion by merit and competitive examinations was unknown, and when it was not necessary for impecunious lords and honourables to become "guinea pigs" in the City, or managing directors of Co-operative Supply Associations, in order to eke out a livelihood.

A son of the third Earl went into the Colonial Governor business, and became Governor of Madras. He afterwards obtained the less onerous post of Clerk of the Pleas of the Exchequer in Ireland, and subsequently became Secretary of the Colonial Department. I presume that, from the accident of his holding this office, the Tasmanians derived the name of Hobart Town for their capital.

There is little more to be said of the Hobarts. All the sons of the present Earl seem to have been brought up to an active life. The eldest was Governor of Madras; the second was formerly Assistant-Secretary to the India Office. A fourth son was an officer of the Bombay Army, but subsequently went into the Church, and obtained the vicarage of Wellesbourne, in Warwickshire, value £422 and a house. A seventh son was aide-de-camp to his brother, the Governor of Madras, and a captain in the Army. The third son entered the Navy, rising in due time to the post of captain. He served at the capture of Bomarsund, in the Russian War of 1854-5. He was afterwards a blockade runner for the Southern slaveowners. Having entered the Turkish service he was compelled to retire from the Royal Navy. Of late, as Hobart Pasha, he has been prominently before the world as the commander of the Turkish Fleet, and the defender of Ottoman misrule, in the columns of the English newspapers. In neither capacity does he appear to have achieved any remarkable success. A des-

endant of John Hampden the paid servant and apologist of the unspeakable Turk—it is enough to make the great patriot turn in his grave!

It is humiliating to think how degenerate may become the sons of noble sires. Sad enough is it to reflect that—

“Imperial Cæsar, dead and turned to clay,
May stop a hole to keep the wind away;”

but that a descendant of Hampden, Hobart, and Maynard should sell his sword to a Government which even Mr. Cowen calls “a scandal to civilization and an outrage on humanity,” is almost sufficient to reconcile us to the fact that the direct posterity of the noblest of men so often die out.

The Addingtons.



THE Addingtons are neither an ancient nor a large-acred house. In all they possess a little over 5,000 acres :—

4,002 in Devonshire,
730 „ Staffordshire,
251 „ Berkshire.

But, remembering what manner of man the first Peer was, I cannot pass them unnoticed. If ever a peerage was built up with the tears and curses of the people it was this.

“Clothed with the Bible as with light,
And with the shadows of the night,
Like Sidmouth, next Hypocrisy
On a crocodile rode by.”

Thus wrote Shelley in his “Mask of Anarchy.” We have already had under notice Eldon and Castlereagh; the third person in that evil triumvirate should not be forgotten.

Henry Addington was the son of a doctor who had the good fortune to attend upon the Earl of Chatham, and by this means the son became acquainted with William Pitt, who took him under his patronage. Addington was intended for the law, but at Pitt’s suggestion he went into Parliament, the brother-in-law of the former making room for him by giving up his seat for Devizes. Five years afterwards, in 1789, through the patronage of Pitt, Addington was elected Speaker of the House of Commons, when he was only 32 years of age. As Addington was poor, the salary was almost immediately advanced from £5,000 to £6,000 per annum. Addington had but small abilities, but he had a profitable knack of making himself agreeable to those in power, especially to the King, so that when Pitt retired from office in 1801 he was offered the post of Prime Minister—a post, as a member of the House of Commons scornfully remarked, for which

he was about as well fitted as one of the doorkeepers of the House. Mr. J. R. Green says he was as dull and bigoted as the King himself, an opinion which is amply borne out by facts. Not satisfied with elevating this incapable Minister to the highest post, the King presented him with a fat sinecure, and, as a residence for life, White Lodge, a house in Richmond-park, which had been built by George II., and had it repaired and adapted for him as a residence. He also fenced off 60 acres of the park for private grounds for Addington, who resided in the mansion for 43 years. The next year Addington had another opportunity of feathering his nest, which he, of course, took care to use. The Clerkship of the Pells—a rich sinecure, worth £3,000 per annum—became vacant, and he appointed his son, a youth who had hardly arrived at years of discretion, and who enjoyed the emoluments till his death, 18 years after. The following year (1803) another rich appointment fell in, the Joint Paymaster-ship of the Forces, worth several thousands a year. Addington at once appointed his brother to that post. His nephew was afterwards appointed to the Embassy at Madrid, at an annual salary of £3,800, and on his retirement therefrom became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs for many years.

A year or two after, the Addington Administration sank, from the sheer weight of its own incapacity, and Pitt had to re-assume office. Lord Brougham said a few years later, in Parliament, that “a more absurd and ridiculous attempt than that of raising Addington to the office of Prime Minister of the country, and particularly at the time he was so raised, had never been heard of.” But that was not Addington’s opinion. Having owed to Pitt everything he possessed, he presumed to consider himself on a level with his patron. On his retirement he received a peerage as a sop to his disappointed pride, and soon after again entered the Cabinet. He also was Lord Privy Seal in the Grenville Administration of 1806, but shortly afterwards retired. On the accession of Lord Liverpool to power in 1812 he resumed office as Home Secretary, and continued to occupy that post till 1822, when he finally retired, to the great joy of the people.

Unquestionably he was the worst Home Secretary that ever held office. Miss Martineau, who describes his “vanity,” his “narrow views,” and his “incompetence,” declares that “his appointment was a great misfortune to the country,”

and that "the multitude thought him a cruel Minister—and so he was." A very pious man he appears to have been individually, but also "one of the harshest of tyrants." He regarded it as his special mission to repress sedition, and he succeeded in creating and sustaining it throughout the country. Some allowance must be made for the frantic terror among the upper classes caused by the excesses of the French Revolution, but there can be no question that the frequent disturbances that occurred year after year were not occasioned by any organised attempt at revolution, but partly by the intolerable suffering of the industrial portion of the people, and partly by the insane attempts made to suppress the most peaceful and inoffensive expressions of popular discontent. Sidmouth's one remedy for social disaffection was not to remove its causes, but to imprison, transport, and hang without mercy. While he held the post of Home Secretary we find fourteen rioters hung at York in 1813, eight more at Leicester in 1817, three more at Nottingham in the same year, and five more at Ely in 1819.

Let us look at Lord Sidmouth in office in 1817, the very year in which he obtained a pension of £3,000 per annum, a pension which he enjoyed for 18 years. In that year the country was in the direst distress, and a large portion of the population were nearly half-starved. Naturally there was a great deal of disaffection, and a man named Oliver, a spy, was employed by the Government to go down into the districts where discontent was most rife. There is no actual proof that the Home Office employed him to get up a rebellion, though it is certain that the local authorities had such full information that they could have prevented it if they had chosen. But Oliver managed to get up an absurd little insurrection of two or three hundred men, Sir Samuel Romilly declaring afterwards, when the matter was debated, that "he believed in his conscience that the whole of the Derbyshire insurrection was the work of persons sent by the Government." The result was that the affair was put down with hardly any trouble, three unfortunate wretches were hanged, and several others transported. As for Sidmouth, he remains branded by Lord Brougham as "the recorded dupe of an informer—of a cheat, in fact, and a murderer by anticipation, of one who went about to ensnare that he might betray, and to corrupt that he might destroy."

At the opening of this Session, 1817, the Prince Regent was hooted in the streets, and a sham attempt at assassination was reported, which nobody believed, and for which there was no trustworthy evidence produced. This bogus attempt was made a pretext for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act, and for shutting up a large number of people in prison, not one of whom was ever brought to trial. Two years after, in 1819, occurred the Manchester massacre, when a peaceable Reform meeting was broken up, and the unarmed multitude charged by the soldiers and yeomanry, some being killed and a large number wounded. Sidmouth thanked the authorities for their brutal conduct, and defended them in Parliament. The same year he prepared and carried what were called the "Six Acts," whose object was to gag and crush all free discussion of grievances. In 1822 Lord Sidmouth finally retired from office. During the whole of the time that he was a Minister of the Crown I am unable to find that he initiated a single measure for the benefit of the people, although the state of the country was frightful beyond description. His last public appearance was to vote in several divisions of the House of Lords against the first Reform Bill. Time would fail me to tell of the host of prosecutions for libel which he instigated against men far worthier than himself. If he and his colleagues had only remained in office a few years longer, England would either have sunk into a decrepit despotism, or have had to save herself by armed revolution.

And what were this worthless Minister's rewards? A peerage and enormous gains from places and pensions. The only good thing I know of him is that when he came in for the fortune of Lord Stowell, whose daughter he had married late in life, he relinquished his pension of £3,000 per annum. Taking into account the various offices he held in his lifetime, the pension he enjoyed, the sinecures of himself and his son, and the value of White Lodge, in Richmond-park, he must have received in the course of his lifetime more than £300,000 for his mischievous work, to say nothing of the fat places of his brother and nephew.

Some of the facts given above I have taken from a very rose-coloured biography of Lord Sidmouth, written by the Rev. George Pellew, D.D., Dean of Norwich. Pellew had reason to speak well of him, for he was Sidmouth's son-in-law. Pellew's father, an admiral, who was created Lord Exmouth

as a reward for his gallant conduct, was a particular friend of Lord Sidmouth. George Pellew, a younger son, went into Holy Orders, and became engaged to Lord Sidmouth's daughter. Sidmouth obtained for the young clergyman a living in the gift of the King, whose estimated value was £1,200. The next year the young couple were married, and the lucky bridegroom obtained another living, worth about £4,000, and a few months afterwards he was presented with a fat prebend in St. Paul's—all which he held at the same time. A few years afterwards this noble pluralist had given up these appointments, because he had received others—viz., the deanery of Norwich, a prebend's stall at York, and a rich city rectory in London. Of late little has been heard of the Addingtons. Happily there are not such tempting opportunities afforded the taxeaters in these days as when the first Lord Sidmouth misgoverned England.

The Conynghams.



NOT the least among the inestimable blessings which we owe to the defunct Irish Church establishment is the creation of a number of peerages. In Ireland, as well as England, several families to whom the clerical profession afforded the first step to rank and fortune, have realized the truth of St. Paul's dictum in a far other way than that conceived by the Apostle himself—Godliness is profitable unto all things having the promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come. The Conynghams, however, appear to have been content for the Church to give them their first lift in the world, and never quartered their sons upon it by dozens, as did the Beresfords and others. The Marquis Conyngham, who professes Liberal politics, by the way, sits in the House of Lords as Baron Minster, of the County of Kent. He owns in—

Donegal	129,846	acres.
Clare	24,059	„
Kent	9,737	„
Meath	9,634	„
Limerick	38	„

Total 173,314 „

He has a seat at Bifrons, near Canterbury, and two seats in Ireland, Mount Charles in Donegal, from which he derives his second title, and Slane in Meath, from which he derives his third.

The brother of the Marquis, Lord Alfred Conyngham, having succeeded to an estate of 53,000 acres, formerly the property of his uncle, Mr. Denison, a wealthy merchant, was created Lord Londesborough, and assumed the name of Denison. His son, the second Lord Londesborough, succeeded him in 1860. It is with the elder branch of the family, however, that we have now to deal.

The Conynghams, as their name denotes, came originally from Scotland. Among the tribes whom that Scottish Joshua, James I., led from the barren wilderness into the lands flowing with milk and honey, was a certain Alexander Conyngham, who obtained two livings in the county of Donegal, and who subsequently received the appointment of Dean of Raphoe. He appears to have diligently fulfilled the divine command, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," for he was the father of no less than twenty-seven children; and with such parental responsibilities we can hardly wonder that he also endeavoured to fulfil another sacred precept—"Go in and possess the land." He appears to have obtained from the Earl of Annandale a lease of the Mount Charles estate in Donegal, which his family henceforth contrived to retain permanently.

His eldest son was Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance in Ireland. He appears to have fought on the side of William III. at the Battle of the Boyne and elsewhere, and died in an encounter with the Rapparees in Sligo. His son, who seems to have taken the opposite side in the wars, when James gave up the contest, kept a great part of his regiment together, and offered his sword to William. He died some years after, fighting in the ranks of the English army in Spain. The Conynghams had in the meantime largely increased their Irish property by obtaining a grant of the Slane estates in Meath, which had been forfeited by Lord Slane in 1641. Whether Charles or Cromwell, James or William was in power, the Conynghams always contrived to be so far attached to the winning side as to gain by a change of masters.

The General Conyngham of whom I have last spoken further augmented the fortunes of the family by his marriage with a wealthy heiress, the daughter of Sir John Williams, of Minster, in Kent. For several centuries the manor of Minster, with other contiguous lands, was the property of Minster Abbey, an ecclesiastical house founded in Anglo-Saxon times. At the dissolution of the monasteries it reverted to the Crown; but in the reign of James I. it was granted to Lucius Cary, Lord Falkland, in consideration of his faithful services and of a sum of £10,000 paid to the King. On his nomination it was regranted to Sir Philip Cary, William Pitt, and John Williams, a London goldsmith. Some time after the heirs of Cary and Williams divided the estate, the manor itself going to the

Williams family. Two sons of General Conyngham successively held the property, the younger of whom was created Baron and Earl Conyngham. He dying without children, the barony (not the earldom) and the family estates passed to a nephew, who assumed the name of Conyngham.

The son of the last-named, who succeeded to the barony in 1787, by the year 1816 had become a marquis. It would be hard to say what services he rendered to the country to justify such rapid promotion, but he happened to be the husband of Lady Conyngham. He was successively created a viscount, an earl, and a marquis, was also a Lieutenant-General in the Army, a Judge of the Marshalsea Court and of the Court of the King's Palace, Lord Steward of the King's Household, and Constable and Lieutenant of Windsor Castle. It appears that the Conynghams had other rewards beside these appointments. Mr. Greville says in his *Memoirs* (1821):—"Lady Conyngham lives in one of the houses in Marlborough-row. All the members of her family are continually there, and are supplied with carriages, horses, etc., from the King's stables. She comports herself entirely as mistress of the household; but never suffers her daughter to leave her. She has received magnificent presents, and Lady Elizabeth (her daughter) the same; particularly the mother has presents of enormous value." "Over, fork over!" is the family motto of the Conynghams, and well did they put it in practice in those days.

Let us look at England in 1829. There are two pictures of the same year, drawn by two writers, the one of the Court, the other of the country. Mr. Molesworth says of the country:—"Trade, manufactures, agriculture, all stagnated. Landlords could not obtain their rents, farmers were impoverished; the agricultural labourer, whose wages were often eked out from the poor-rates, received for his family and himself the barest necessities of life. The manufacturing operatives of Lancashire and Yorkshire were, in many instances, receiving only threepence and fourpence a day for more than twelve hours' labour; and in Ireland the peasantry were reduced to the smallest allowance of the lowest kind of food." Now let us turn to a picture of the Court, drawn by Mr. Greville, Clerk of the Privy Council. He says:—"The wealth Lady Conyngham must have accumulated by savings and presents must be enormous. The King continues to heap all kinds of presents upon her; and she lives at his expense; they do not possess

a servant ; even Lord Conyngham's *valet de chambre* is not properly their servant. They all have situations in the King's household, from which they receive their pay while they continue in the service of the Conynghams. They dine every day while in London at St. James's, and when they give a dinner it is cooked at St. James's, and brought up to Hamilton-place in hackney coaches and in machines made expressly for the purpose ; there is merely a fire lit in the kitchen for such things as must be treated on the spot. A more despicable scene cannot be exhibited than that which the interior of our Court presents—every base, low, unmanly propensity, with selfishness, avarice, and a life of petty intrigue and mystery." It was said after the death of George IV. that Lady Conyngham was in possession of jewels worth £80,000 which had been given to her by that monarch. Schiller, in one of his greatest tragedies, makes Lady Milford say, "Should I encircle my brows with the curses of the prince's subjects? Would'st thou have me dragged to the earth by the dreadful weight of their tears of misery?" But that was only in fiction.

The eldest son of this noble pair, Earl Mount Charles, and subsequently second Marquis Conyngham, shared in the good fortune of his parents. He was appointed Master of the Robes to the King, salary £4,000 ; and Groom of the Bedchamber, salary £500 ; and, although a man of no ability, he became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and afterwards a Lord of the Treasury in the Tory Government. About the time of the first Reform Bill he turned with the tide, and became, by profession at least, a Whig, a conversion which apparently was of much more importance to himself than to his country, for in 1834 he received the appointment of Postmaster-General, and the following year he was made Lord Chamberlain, salary £3,000 per annum, his younger brother receiving the appointment of Vice-Chamberlain, with an annual salary of £600. This Marquis was also an ornamental Lieutenant-General in the Army.

The present Marquis was formerly State Steward to the Viceroy of Ireland, salary £506 ; and Equerry to the Queen, salary £500. His eldest son, Lord Mount Charles, holds the latter office at the present time.

The Finches.

THE Earl of Aylesford has long been a prominent figure at Court, and has more recently become a prominent figure at another Court, which can boast of as promiscuous a crowd as the Epsom Race-course on a Derby Day, and where lords and louts, countesses and courtesans, jostle each other almost daily. But who *is* the Earl of Aylesford? many people are just now asking. They know that he went with the Heir Apparent to India, and that the most distinguished and gracious lady, but one, in the land was sponsor for his infant daughter—the poor child will need a godmother badly enough, and, happily, has a good one; but beyond that, outside the ranks of “Society,” the Earl of Aylesford was unknown. His lordship owns in

Warwickshire	.	.	12,158	acres	.	.	£19,188	rental.
Leicestershire	.	.	4,272	„	.	.	6,710	„
Kent	.	.	2,856	„	.	.	6,259	„
			<hr/>				<hr/>	
Total			19,286	„	.	.	£32,157	„

He has seats at Aylesford, Kent, and Packington Hall, near Coleshill, Warwickshire. Moreover, he is patron of seven livings, viz., Ashby Magna and Saxelby, Leicestershire; Bedworth, Bickenhill, Meriden, and Packington, Warwickshire; and Ditton, in Kent; and to two of these he has actually presented. O ye 97 bishops assembled in the Pan-Anglican Synod,—ye Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the abuses, “*if any*,” connected with patronage in the Church; and especially you, my Lord Bishop of Peterborough, can you bestow a passing thought on this little fact? Here is a man who, according to the statement of the Queen’s Proctor, “a few months after his marriage, would dine with countesses and personal friends, and then spend the remainder of the evening at such places as the Alhambra and Cremorne, supping with persons of dissolute character; after that, he would visit his

club, and find his way back to his residence in a state of intoxication"—and he has the right to appoint for life clergymen to the cure of souls in seven English parishes! It matters nothing to me that he is a member of the most distinguished Conservative Club in London—probably Mephistophiles would say "he is not the first"; I care little that in the House of Lords he possesses as much legislative power as Lord Selborne or the Earl of Carnarvon—so much the worse for the House of Lords; but it is monstrous that there are seven parishes, with an aggregate population of more than eight thousand souls, dependent for the appointment of their spiritual pastors upon such a man as this. The evil of the patronage system is not to be treated by tinkering with donatives and the sale of next presentations; it will remain a scandal and a shame so long as right of nomination is a property which may be inherited by persons utterly unqualified for its exercise in the interest of the Church or the people.

The Finches, like many other comparatively modern houses, claim to be of Norman descent. According to Dugdale, they were originally Herberts, descended from the William Fitzherbert who was the ancestor of the various branches of the Herbert family; but one of them marrying an heiress of the name of Finch, henceforth they assumed that less notable patronymic. For a long period they appear to have been an undistinguished line of Sussex squires, but at the suppression of the monasteries Sir William Finch obtained a grant of a part of the possessions of the ancient Monastery of St. Augustine, at Canterbury, fragments of whose broken walls still stand at the east end of the Cathedral. Sir Moyle Finch, a descendant of Sir William, married a daughter of Sir Thomas Heneage, of Essex, from whom was derived the Christian name of Heneage borne by the first and every succeeding Earl of Aylesford down to the present time.

In the seventeenth century the Finch family produced four lawyers, each of whom rose to distinction. Sir Henry, the younger brother of Sir Moyle Finch, was a sergeant-at-law, whose son, Sir John Finch, became Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Lord Keeper. He it was who made himself odious to the people by his base subserviency to the tyrant Charles as Speaker of the House of Commons, and subsequently in the Hampden Ship Money case, and who, having been impeached by the Long Parliament, fled in terror across

the sea. The third son of Sir Moyle became Recorder of the City of London and Speaker of the House of Commons. His eldest son, Heneage, became Attorney-General, and afterwards Lord Chancellor, in the reign of Charles II., being created first Lord Finch and subsequently Earl of Nottingham. Macaulay says of him that "through his prosperous career he had always held the prerogative as high as he honestly or decently could; but he had never been concerned in any machinations against the fundamental laws of the realm. In the midst of a corrupt Court he had kept his personal integrity unsullied." His eldest son inherited not only the earldom of Nottingham from his father, but also the earldom of Winchelsea from a distant kinsman, and henceforward the two titles became united in his descendants. He married the only daughter of Lord Hatton, and the Earls of Winchelsea and Nottingham are now Finch-Hattons. Of this branch of the family there is nothing remarkable to record, save that one of them fought a duel with the Duke of Wellington over a political quarrel, and that, more recently, a scion of the house has figured in the Bankruptcy Court as a gay spendthrift, and in a Police Court in support of the extraordinary theory that if a man has a handle to his name he has a right to take his dog into a railway carriage.

The second son of the first Earl of Nottingham was Heneage Finch, as distinguished a lawyer as his father. In the latter part of the reign of Charles II. he had gained an evil fame by appearing for the Crown in the vindictive prosecutions of the Whigs, but, being a zealous churchman, he refused to defend the dispensing power claimed by James II. not long after his accession, and was thereupon dismissed from the post of Solicitor-General. At the trial of the Seven Bishops, Finch was one of their counsel, and acquired considerable popularity by the result. On the flight of James he made an abortive proposal to establish a Regency. In 1703 he was created Baron Guernsey, by Anne, and, in 1714, Earl of Aylesford, by George I.

Aylesford, a little town on the banks of the Medway not far from Maidstone, and contiguous to Kits Coty House, and to Horsted, the burial-place of Horsa, is a place memorable in history. Here it was that our Saxon forefathers, on their march from Thanet, first encountered and defeated the ancient Britons. In course of time a priory was erected at Aylesford, from whence is derived the name of "The Friars," the seat of

the Finches. Some time after the dissolution of the monasteries it came into the possession of the Sedleys, and here was born Sir Charles Sedley, one of the wittiest of the gay rhymesters of the Court of Charles II. A certain Caleb Banks, of Maidstone, and his son, Sir John Banks, about that time became large purchasers of lands in that part of Kent, and Aylesford was among the properties acquired by the latter. One of Sir John's daughters married Heneage Finch, the first Earl of Aylesford, and, beside the Aylesford Priory estate, the manors of Shales Court, Great Buckland, Newnham Court, Eccles, Bowes Place, Bredhurst, Meres Court, and other properties, passed into the possession of the Finch family. One or two other properties in Kent were acquired by direct grant from the Crown, but these appear to have been subsequently sold.

The eldest son of the first Earl further advanced the fortunes of the house by marriage. He contracted an alliance with a daughter and co-heir of John Fisher, of Great Packington, in Warwickshire. Packington, near Coleshill, was anciently part of the possessions of the priory of Kenilworth, which was erected hard by the renowned castle. At the dissolution of the religious houses it was granted to a John Fisher, a gentleman-pensioner of Henry VIII., in consideration of the payment of a sum of £621. The son of this John Fisher made a park of the outwoods and other grounds, and the property passed to the Finches by the marriage of one of his daughters to the second Earl of Aylesford.

With Heneage Finch, the first Earl of Aylesford, the vital energy of the family seems to have been exhausted; since his time they have simply run to seed; the fourth earl, however, did for a time hold the courtier office of Lord Steward of the Household. The family livings have come in handy for the younger sons, no less than seven of them having taken holy orders in less than a hundred years. Fifty years ago one of these held two family livings worth £830 per annum and two houses; another held a living worth nearly £1,000 a-year and a Royal chaplaincy; another held a fat rectory and a prebend's stall at Gloucester; another held a rectory with £600 a-year and a house. There were two or three other pluralist Finches besides, but they belonged to the Winchelsea branch of the family.

The Lowthers.

ALTHOUGH the Lowthers are immensely rich, they can scarcely claim to be an illustrious family. Thomas Moore, in his "Diary," under date February 22, 1827, writes:—"Talked of Erskine's speech in defence of Peter Pindar for a libel against Lord Lonsdale, in which he had compared Lord Lonsdale to the Devil. Erskine dwelt on the grandeur of the Devil, as described by Milton, and insisted that it was rather he that should be displeased at being compared to Lord Lonsdale." If Erskine was right in insinuating that a former Lord Lonsdale was lacking in grandeur of character, he certainly could not deny that he possessed all the grandeur that could be derived from almost boundless wealth and absolute political power. As will be seen hereafter the Lowthers have owed a very great deal to the favour of the Crown, and from lavish Royal grants have mainly derived the foundation of their fortunes; but it is equally certain that some members of the family have by foresight, enterprise, and a wise expenditure of capital, turned their opportunities to excellent advantage. They were almost the creators of Whitehaven, and though doubtless, sooner or later, in any case, Whitehaven would have developed itself like Middlesbro' and Barrow, in all probability its growth would have been far slower than it has been, but for the Lowther family.

The owner of Lowther and Whitehaven Castles, and of Barleythorpe, near Oakham, possesses in

Cumberland . . .	28,228 acres . . .	£42,819 rental.
Westmoreland . . .	39,229 „ . . .	27,141 „
Rutland . . .	493 „ . . .	1,251 „
Total 67,950 „ . . .		£71,211 „

He also is the owner of about 40 livings in the Church whose united value, including parsonages and glebes, must be worth nearly £10,000 a-year. More than 50,000 persons are

dependent for the appointment of their spiritual pastors upon the Earls of Lonsdale. Can the Church ever be the Church of the people while thousands of the clergy are dependent upon great landowners for bread and promotion? More than once the clergy have done much to alienate the people by their determined hostility to political progress, but we can hardly expect anything better so long as great houses have 20, 30, or 40 livings in their gift.

The Lowthers were seated for many generations at the Manor of Lowther, in Westmorland. One of them, who was Attorney-General to Edward I., also possessed the manor and town of Widehope, in Cumberland. For a century or two they quietly grew in importance and wealth, and in the reign of Charles I. the most distinguished member of the family was Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In the reign of Charles II. the Lowthers obtained large and important grants of land from the Crown, which they put to good use. Sir John Lowther, and his son Sir James, energetically developed the mineral resources of their estates. At the Restoration, Whitehaven was an obscure little village. Sir John and his son expended between them at least half-a-million of money in mining operations, and the result was, that in 1758 the income of the head of the house amounted to £40,000 a year. The Sir John Lowther who took part in the Revolution of 1688 was for a time First Lord of the Treasury, but he made no considerable figure as a statesman, although he had two good places—one in the Treasury, the other in the Household—and received from the King's own hand a gratuity of 2,000 guineas. He was created Viscount Lonsdale in 1696. His two sons succeeded him, but on the death of the second, without issue, the peerage became extinct, and the property and a baronetcy passed to a distant relation, Sir James Lowther, the great borough-monger, who married the daughter of the Earl of Bute. In 1784 he was created Earl of Lonsdale. Having no legitimate issue he adopted the son of a distant relative, who was a clergyman at Swillington, in Yorkshire, who succeeded to the estates and to the dignity of Viscount Lowther. He was created Earl of Lonsdale in 1807, and was the greatgrandfather of the present earl. One of his daughters married Lord Frederick Cavendish Bentinck, and their son is the Mr. Cavendish Bentinck who is the Lowther nominee (I cannot call him member) for the borough of Whitehaven.

Let us glance at a few of the comfortable little transactions of the Lowthers in Crown lands. In the reign of Charles I. a Lowther was Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and he purchased for his son or nephew the lands of the dissolved monastery of St. Bees in Cumberland. The son of this Lowther and his immediate successor obtained a grant of messuage, etc., at St. Bees, with the salthouses, pier, and quay, and all lands between high and low water mark belonging to the manor for ever. In 1666 he obtained another grant of "all the ungranted lands in the district," and in 1678 of all the lands for two miles northward between high and low water mark. These grants laid the foundation of that lucrative Whitehaven estate which is the chief source of the prosperity of the Lowthers.

In 1660 Sir John Lowther was appointed Steward of the Royal Barony of Kendal. In 1694 the Lowthers obtained a lease of three-fourths of this barony, to expire in the year 1804. They paid £1,000 cash, and 10s. a year rent. In 1790, according to a Government return, they derived a profit of £380 a year therefrom, and in 1810 they purchased it outright for £14,000.

In 1822 the Lowthers purchased of the Crown the manor of Ennerdale, with all the mines, quarries, etc.—961 acres in all—for a sum of £2,500. They had previously rented it for an annual payment of £2 17s. 8d. and one-tenth of the profits of the mines. Comment upon these scandalous transactions is altogether superfluous.

I cannot pass without special notice that representative of the family, Sir James Lowther, the great borough-monger, a man beside whom a hungry thief is a paragon of virtue. "In him," says Mr. Massey, in his "History of England during the Reign of George III.," "rapacity degenerated into mere dishonesty; it took the paltry form of cheating tradespeople. If his creditors were neighbours, his reason for refusing to pay them was that 'he knew them to be knaves'; if they lived at a distance 'how could he know who they were?' Among the creditors whom Lord Lonsdale thus defrauded was the father of William Wordsworth, who died, leaving the poet and four other helpless children. The executors of the will, foreseeing the result of a legal contest with a millionaire, withdrew opposition, trusting to Lord Lonsdale's sense of justice for payment. They leaned on a broken reed; the worthy debtor 'died and made no sign.'" All this is amply proved by Lord Rocking-

ham's memoirs. I recollect reading somewhere that this claim was ultimately discharged by the next Earl, to whom the poet afterwards wrote one of his sonnets. The Earl had brought three actions for libel against three local newspapers, in which he was successful, and Wordsworth wrote :—

“ And if the moral on thy scutcheon teach
With truth ‘ The Magistracy shows the man,’
That searching test thy public course has stood ;
As will be owned alike by bad and good,
Soon as the memory of life's little span
Shall place thy virtues out of Envy's reach.”

Considering Wordsworth's semi-feudal proclivities, I cannot regard this certificate of good character as of any great value.

Sir James, who married the daughter of Lord Bute, endeavoured in 1768 to wrest from the Duke of Portland the manor of Penrith and forest of Inglewood, in Cumberland. The property had been granted by William III. to the first Earl of Portland about seventy years previously. Lowther, whose family had already been crammed with Crown Grants and Crown Leases, bargained with the Government that he should litigate the Duke's claim to the property on condition of a lease of it being granted to himself. Lowther wanted more land ; the Government wanted two more votes in the House of Commons. Lowther's application for a lease was made behind the Duke of Portland's back ; and, although the Duke was promised that no steps should be taken till he had time to represent his case, a grant to Lowther was made out by the Treasury—“ a gross and glaring iniquity,” as Mr. Massey truly calls it. The landowners became alarmed for the security of their own holdings ; the *Nullus Tempus* Act was passed to prevent such transactions in future, though the Government contrived to slip in a clause excepting any claim that might be prosecuted within a year. No one supposed that Lowther would insist upon the validity of his monstrous lease ; but he proceeded to enforce his unrighteous claims in the most cruel manner. Four hundred ejectments were served in one day, twenty-five actions were commenced, and fifteen Bills in equity filed. Then another Bill was brought in to repeal the saving clause in the former one ; and, though it was not passed, Lowther, in alarm, abandoned his ejectments and lawsuits. The Lowther grant was reversed by the Court of Exchequer in

1771. Lest Mr. Massey's condemnation of this "shameful transaction" may be thought too severe, I may add that Hughes endorses the strong language in which Junius denounced it, and even Adolphus declares that "it was obvious there was a disposition in the Ministry to gratify Sir James Lowther at the expense of the Duke of Portland; and in that view the transaction was not honourable either to the Ministry or to the person preferred."

Sir James Lowther had the honour of introducing William Pitt into Parliament. At the age of twenty-one Pitt became member for Appleby. Pitt's own account of the transaction shows what an utter sham Parliamentary representation had become. He writes thus to his mother:—"I can now inform you that I have seen Sir James Lowther, who has repeated to me the offer he had before made, and in the handsomest manner. . . . No kind of condition was mentioned, but that, if ever our lines of conduct should become opposite, I should give him an opportunity of choosing another person. Appleby is the place I am to represent, and the election will be made without my having any trouble or even visiting my constituents." Pitt was not ungrateful; Sir James was afterwards created an Earl.

Lord Lonsdale reduced borough-mongering to a science. He held some property in the little rotten borough of Haslemere, now disfranchised, and in order to return its two members he actually imported into it forty Cumberland colliers, who were provided with cottages, and were paid half a guinea a week each for twenty years, in return for which they only had to vote as he told them, for two taxeaters, who each drew some thousands annually of public money. This same Lord Lonsdale at one time returned the two members for Cumberland, but at one election the Duke of Portland started an opposition candidate, and these two noblemen spent between them no less than £100,000 in the contest; after which they agreed to save their money in the future by each nominating one member. In all, Lord Lonsdale returned no less than nine members to the House of Commons, who were contemptuously called "Lord Lonsdale's people" by Grenville, just as if they had been so many flunkies.

The father of this unworthy nobleman was Robert Lowther, at one time Governor of Barbadoes, who in 1721 was taken into custody by order of the Privy Council for his tyrannical

and corrupt administration of the island. The Lords of the Admiralty complained that the Governor had imprisoned two captains of men-of-war, had taken away the commission of the local Judge of the Admiralty, and that he had proceeded tyrannically against the missionaries for the propagation of the Gospel. His case appeared so black that the Attorney-General (one of his counsel) refused to plead for him.

The Grosvenors.

THE modern hell, according to the great philosopher of Chelsea, is the hell of not making money ; the modern heaven, of course, being the making of money in large profusion. There is some amount of truth in this cynical estimate of English Society. It is the prevalence of this idea which to a large extent popularises, or perhaps we had better say vulgarises, our aristocracy. We have had most noble dukes created for almost every ostensible reason, save that the receivers of the title were the most noble persons in the land. To give a fair start in life to a Royal bastard, to reward a successful general, to gratify the ambition of a statesman, to add new lustre to a great historic house that has rendered eminent service to the country—these are reasons that we can at any rate understand ; but to elevate a man to a dukedom because he happens to be the biggest ground landlord in London is an action which I, for one, cannot admire, though a Liberal Government is responsible for it. There is little to be said either for or against the Grosvenors, who have always been a race of respectable mediocrities, occasionally exhibiting some amount of public spirit, and not altogether devoid of popular sympathies. As I think of the long line of Grosvenors, whose great object of existence has always seemed to lay house to house and field to field, I am irresistibly reminded of Dryden's lines on Shadwell—

“The midwife laid her hands on his thick skull
With this prophetic blessing—Be thou dull !”

One can almost write their history in half a verse of Scripture : —“They did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded.” The present head of the house, however, must be excepted. If we cannot forget his ungracious opposition to Reform, those who were faithful during the last three years to England's traditional policy of Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over, will ever remember the wise

and noble part he played as President of the Eastern Question Association.

The great house of Grosvenor has been built up mainly by a succession of fortunate marriages. The present and first Duke (1874 is the date of creation) owns in

Cheshire	.	.	.	15,001	acres	.	.	£29,250	rental.
Flint	.	.	.	3,335	"	.	.	4 925	"
Denbigh	.	.	.	855	"	.	.	1,838	"
Bucks	.	.	.	246	"	.	.	1,137	"
				<hr/>				<hr/>	
Total				19,437	"			£37,150	"

This statement, however, gives a very inadequate idea of his vast wealth. As all the world knows, hundreds of houses in the West-end of London stand upon ground which is the property of the Duke, and from which he draws an enormous revenue. The prospective value of his metropolitan estates, when the present leases fall in, is beyond the wildest dreams of avarice. The Dowager Marchioness, mother of the Duke, owns 12,534 acres in Dorset and Wilts, in the neighbourhood of Shaftesbury and Fonthill. She has a representative in Parliament, Mr. Benett-Stanford, who nominally sits for Shaftesbury. The Duke's uncle, Earl Grey de Wilton, owns 8,043 acres in Lancashire, and another uncle, Lord Ebury, also owns a smaller estate in Hertfordshire.

The Grosvenors are supposed to have come over with the Conqueror. Possibly their name is derived from an ancestor holding the office of Grand Huntsman to the Dukes of Normandy, though it may be that one of the race obtained the name simply on account of his love for the chase. They profess to be descended from a nephew of Hugh Lupus, the great Norman Earl of Chester. Hugh Lupus is the Christian name of the present Duke, and Lupus also gives a designation to one of his streets in Pimlico. A brief epitome of the agrarian history of the house is written in the names of the London streets and squares which they own. Grosvenor Square and Place bear their patronymic; Eaton Square and Place are called after their chief seat; Eccleston, Chester, and Belgrave Squares after different portions of their Cheshire estates; Davies-street and Ebury-street from Mary Davies, of Ebury, who brought the London property into the family by her marriage; Wilton-crescent tells of the acquisition of the

Grey de Wilton title and lands by a Grosvenor; Motcombe-street derives its name from the mansion of the Dowager Marchioness in Dorsetshire; Halkin-street from a property in Flintshire.

Eaton Hall, in Cheshire, is a magnificent modern mansion, which replaced one of smaller dimensions built in the time of William III. Eaton, and other contiguous properties, were acquired in the reign of Henry VI. by the marriage of Raufe de Grosvenor with Joan, only daughter and heiress of John Eaton, Lord of the Manor of Eaton, and of a lucrative fishery in the Dee, which latter appears to have been obtained by a grant from the Crown. Raufe's grandson, Richard, contracted another wealthy marriage, with Catherine, co-heiress of Richard Cotton, a great landowner in Cheshire and the neighbouring counties, by which Oscroft and other places came into the possession of the Grosvenors. In the reign of James I. the head of the house was created a baronet, and subsequently steadily supported the Parliamentary Party in the following reign. His son and grandson, however, were ardent Royalists, and their property was sequestrated during the Commonwealth, but reverted to them at the Restoration.

The son of this grandson was a firm supporter of the Revolution of 1688. He it was who contracted the most fortunate of all the Grosvenor marriages, that with Mary Davies, only child of Alexander Davies, of Ebury Manor, Middlesex. It is said that this Davies derived his wealth mainly from the property and title deeds left in his charge during the great Plague of 1665, and which were never reclaimed by their owners, and that Davies was thus enabled to make large purchases of land in the West of London. I cannot, however, reconcile this statement with another made by the Rev. M. Walcott in his "*Annals of Westminster*," that on July 2, 1665, Alexander Ebury (Davies), of Ebury, county Middlesex, was buried in the yard to the north of St. Margaret's Church, adding, "through his daughter and heir, Mary, all his extensive property round London devolved upon his grandson, Sir Robert Grosvenor, who lived at Peterborough House, Millbank." This Peterborough House originally belonged to the Mordaunts, Earls of Peterborough, and was purchased of the last Earl—the eccentric nobleman who distinguished himself by his romantic daring in Spain—by the Grosvenors, who in 1735 rebuilt the house, which was finally removed in 1809.

In 1758 Sir Richard Grosvenor purchased the manor of Eccleston, which includes Belgrave; and since that time the Grosvenors have still further added to their Cheshire property by the purchase of lands at Lower Kimerton, Pulford, Pulton, Claverton, etc. The Sir Richard who purchased Eccleston was raised to the peerage under the title of Baron Grosvenor, and subsequently of Viscount Belgrave and Earl Grosvenor, as he had proved very useful to Pitt in electioneering business. I have no means of ascertaining how many hundreds of thousands the Duke of Westminster receives annually from his estates; in case it should become known at some future time, it may be worth while to note that Cole in 1779 estimated the annual rental of the Grosvenor estates at £27,000.

A nephew of the first Earl Grosvenor made another lucky marriage with the heiress of Edward Drax, of Charlborough. The daughter of this last married a gentleman who assumed her name, and is the present J. S. W. S. Erle Drax, M.P. He and his daughters own between them some 20,000 acres in Dorset and other counties. The Dorsetshire property is mostly situated in the borough of Wareham, a decaying dead-and-alive little place, with many acres but few electors, where a man changes his politics if he moves from one side of the street to the other. Mr. Erle Drax at the last election asked his serfs to send him to Parliament "to oppose old Gladstone," but he has not done much in that direction. As he only votes on the average about twice in a Session, this ridiculous little borough will not lose much by being put out of its misery at the next redistribution of seats. Perhaps it would be as well to keep it in existence, just to show what monstrous anomalies in the Constitution the Tories maintained and defended.

In the eighteenth century the Grosvenors occasionally held office as Mayors of Chester, to which city some of them were liberal benefactors, and for which some of them constantly sat in Parliament. The inscription on the family monument in Eccleston Church records the fact that the two first baronets sat for the county, and the third baronet and all his male descendants for the city of Chester, down to the date when the monument was erected. Until very recently Chester was represented by at least one Grosvenor from the accession of George I.—certainly without a break from that time till the reign of William IV. Occasionally two Grosvenors sat for the city at the same time, but at last the independent party

gathered so much strength that the head of the great house at Eaton Hall "magnanimously" announced that, in future, only one Grosvenor should be nominated.

John Bull is a very patient animal ; but some day perhaps he will begin to compare the relative proportions of taxation born by such leviathans as the Duke of Westminster and by struggling professional men with from £200 to £500 per annum, and then he will wonder that he could have been such a fool as to uphold the injustice so long. I give John Bull facts ; he must draw his own conclusions. Here is just one fact, in conclusion, significant enough in its way. Mr. John Macdonell says in his admirable work on the Land Question, "Any one who examines the local or private measures, passed for the most part in the reigns of George III. and George IV., in order to 'pave, cleanse, light, water, and embellish' various squares in London, will find them studded with acts of favouritism to landlords. Looking, for instance, into 7th Geo. IV. c. 58, relating to Grosvenor-place and other lanes and streets adjoining, I find among its 140 clauses, one giving powers to Commissioners to compel owners and builders of houses where there ought to be streets to pave, level, or gravel them. But the Act specially exempted Robert, Earl Grosvenor, from paying for the improvement of his own property. It also empowered him to put whatever fences or gates he was pleased to erect on streets which others maintained." Since then legislation has proceeded very much on the same lines. I should like to know how much, or rather how little, the Duke of Westminster has paid for metropolitan improvements since the Metropolitan Board of Works was created.

The Beresfords.

ONE of my earliest recollections in newspaper reading is the report of a speech by a certain violent Protectionist, one Major Beresford, who used to harangue the Essex farmers at Castle Hedingham. In that speech the gallant Major spoke of the mass of his fellow-citizens as "the swinish multitude," for it was spoken long before any one dreamed of household suffrage in the counties. Now-a-days the Major's Tory successor, Colonel Brise, speaks even of the agricultural labourers with respect, and tells them that their admission to the register is only a question of time. When the gallant Major spoke of "the swinish multitude" I did not understand what superior creatures the Beresfords were, and now that I know a little more of their history I am overwhelmed with awe. O ye Conservative electors for the borough of Southwark, how I envy you the privilege of voting for a member that bears the illustrious name! That second candidate of yours, Mr. Edward Clarke, is, after all, only one of the swinish multitude, for I well remember crossing swords with him at a juvenile debating society in the City. Him, with all his dexterous special pleading, you can afford to dispense with; but Southwark would indeed sink back to her old plebeian position if she failed to re-elect a Beresford, however remotely connected with the illustrious Marquis of Waterford.

The head of this prolific tribe owns in

Waterford . . .	40,050 acres . . .	£25,949 rental.
*Londonderry . . .	36,019 „ . . .	15,787 „
Wicklow . . .	26,324 „ . . .	5,033 „
Leitrim . . .	4,682 „ . . .	2,430 „
Kilkenny . . .	1,456 „ . . .	1,107 „
Antrim . . .	426 „ . . .	186 „
Cavan . . .	222 „ . . .	102 „

Total 109,179 „ . . . £50,594 „

* Lately sold, according to the newspapers.

There is a Dowager Marchioness who owns 6,537 acres in Northumberland, and 296 in Hampshire. The heirs of Lord Decies, a Beresford, own 6,394 acres in Northumberland, 20 in Westmorland, and 979 in Meath. Then there is Lady De la Poer Beresford, with 5,198 acres in Argyll; also Lord Charles Beresford, with 19,688 acres in five Irish counties; also D. W. P. Beresford, with 7,266 acres in Carlow; also J. B. Beresford, with 11,389 acres in Londonderry and Donegal; and the Most Reverend Gervaise Beresford, with 8,590 acres in eight Irish counties. Thus we have in all a grand total of 175,436 acres.

I presume that the Beresfords came over with the Conqueror. At any rate, it appears that John de Beresford held the Manor of Bereford, or Beresford, in the parish of Alstonfield, in Stafford, in the time of William Rufus. A cadet of the house was seated in Derbyshire in 1475, and from him was descended one Tristram Beresford, a younger son of a large family who lived in the reign of James I. This Tristram was appointed manager of the Ulster plantations of the Corporation of the City of London; so that less than 300 years ago the Beresfords did not own a single foot of land in Ireland. Apparently Tristram prospered in his office, and shortly after the Restoration his son was created an Irish baronet. The second baronet was fortunate enough to fight on the winning side, for William III. against James II., and was still more fortunate in marrying an Irish heiress. Sir Marcus, son of the last-mentioned, followed his father's example, and contracted a marriage with the Baroness De la Poer, daughter and heiress of the Earl of Tyrone.

The De la Poers had feathered their nest in Ireland some centuries before. The first De la Poer accompanied Strongbow to Ireland on the invasion of that country by Henry II., and for the services he rendered he obtained considerable territorial grants. Of course the Irish were fair game for plunder; and it is only proper that a filibustering King should reward his soldiers with stolen lands. Among the grants obtained by De la Poer was the City of Waterford and the surrounding territory, including Curraghmore. Henceforth Curraghmore became the seat of the De la Poer family. The demesne is five miles in length, and consists of 4,000 acres in the golden Valley of the Suir. Part of the ancient castle is still standing, but the mansion was erected in 1700. The

De la Poers must have been pleasant landlords. When they hunted, the peasants had to supply their dogs with bread, milk, and butter; when any distinguished guest visited them, the tenants had to provide meat, drink, and lights; when a son of the De la Poers went to England, the tenants had to pay a tribute to provide his outfit; when a daughter of the De la Poers was married, each husbandman had to provide a sheep and each village a cow for her dowry.

On the marriage of Sir Marcus with the Baroness De la Poer he was raised to the peerage under the title of Viscount Tyrone, and a few years after, in 1746, he became Earl of Tyrone. This first Earl of Tyrone had three sons and six daughters, whose progeny was almost innumerable; in fact it is their overwhelming number, and their extraordinary rapacity, which fills me with awe at the outset. I cannot attempt to speak of them in detail; they baffle all description. It was said, and apparently with truth, that they and their connexions at one time monopolised one-fourth of the places in Ireland. They swarmed in the Army, in the Civil Service, and in the Church. The second son of the Earl was for many years Chief Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland, and also taster of the wines in the port of Dublin. When Earl Fitzwilliam was Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland he made an honest endeavour to govern the country equitably; but in order to accomplish that object he dismissed the Beresfords from office, whereupon he himself was recalled. The grief of the people was so great that the City of Dublin went into general mourning, and the Irish House of Commons passed a resolution regretting his recall, the only dissentient voice being that of Mr. Beresford. Soon after, the dismissal of Lord Fitzwilliam gave rise to accrimonious debates in both the Houses of Parliament at home, the result being a hostile meeting between Lord Fitzwilliam and Mr. Beresford at Tyburn, which was opportunely stopped by the police.

The great pasture-ground of the Beresfords used to be the Irish Church. About a generation ago an account was drawn up from various Parliamentary returns which showed what profits various branches of the family derived from taking Holy Orders. First on the list is Lord John G. Beresford, Bishop of Cork and Ross, then of Raphoe, then of Clogher, then Archbishop of Dublin, and ultimately Archbishop of Armagh. From 1805 to 1834 he drew from the revenues of the Church

£348,683. Next there was the Rev. George Beresford, Bishop of Kilmore, who in 32 years received £296,864. Next the Rev. Charles Beresford, four years Rector of Killashee, and 25 years Rector of Termoumaquirk, who received £111,225. Next the Hon. and Rev. G. D. Beresford, Rector of four livings, who in 34 years received £57,926. Next the Hon. and Rev. W. Beresford, who in 26 years received from four livings £38,210. Next there was Lord Decies, who in 28 years received from two livings £36,619. Next there was the Rev. J. J. Beresford, who in 13 years received from two livings £13,532. And, finally, there was the Rev. J. G. Beresford, who in nine years received from two livings £13,395. Thus in 34 years eight Beresfords drew from Ireland as ministers or dignitaries of the Irish Church no less a sum than £916,454. Need we be surprised that so many Beresfords are at the present time great landed proprietors in the Sister Island? I may add that prior to this time a former Lord Decies had received £200,000 from one of the Archbishoprics.

Besides the Beresfords in the Church, there were a considerable number in the Army and the Civil Service, of whom I cannot speak particularly. I may, however, take two or three samples of the rest. First on the list comes General Viscount Beresford—an illegitimate son, but the most distinguished of the whole family. He commanded the British army in the bloody but victorious battle of Albuera, was wounded at Salamanca, and, under the direction of Wellington, attacked and carried the fortified heights of Toulouse against the French at the close of the Peninsular War. For these services he received very liberal remuneration. He was awarded an annual pension of £2,000 by Act of Parliament for his own life and those of his two immediate successors; he obtained an ornamental colonelcy at an annual value of £1,182, a captaincy of a cadet company, annual value £469, and the Governorship of Jersey, salary £1,100. The next tax-eating Beresford was H. B. Beresford, who received £2,157 annually as compensation for abolition of the sinecure office of storekeeper of the Customs, and J. C. Beresford, who also received the like amount for the abolition of a similar office.

Looking at the past history of the Beresfords in connection with the Irish Church, I must admit that that Church is a standing miracle. That she could have survived two or three generations of Beresfords is almost sufficient to convince the

most ardent Catholic of the validity of her orders. Of late the Beresfords have managed for the most part to exist without quartering themselves upon the country. Of the personal merits of the principal members of this house the less said the better. A generation ago the escapades of the third Marquis were a public scandal. As to the present Marquis, he is young enough yet to redeem the past, and we need not remember against him the sins of his youth.

The Beauclerks.

DON'T let poor Nelly starve ! " said Charles II. on his death-bed, and the request was duly attended to ; in fact, the nation has provided " poor Nelly's " descendants with a comfortable income ever since. As Charles left a hoard of many thousands, for the most part consisting of bribes he had received from the King of France, I think he might have provided for Nelly and her children himself. However, I cannot help feeling a sneaking kindness for the Hereford girl, who, from selling oranges at the theatre, rose to be not merely the favourite actress of the time, but the mother of a duke and the ancestress of a bishop. Of course his Majesty the King or his Royal Highness the Prince is as much bound to obey the laws of God as I am, and I do not see, for my part, why the plea of temptation should avail him, in regard to the Seventh Commandment, any more than it would a ragged pickpocket in regard to the Eighth ; but there are degrees of guilt even among Royal mistresses. One could not speak unkindly of " the little harmless devil " of glorious John Dryden's epilogues any more than old Samuel Pepys, who, having gone to the play, puts down in his Diary that " he was pleased with the sight, and especially kissing of Nell," after the play was over. Who would not rather be descended from that honest, good-tempered, unpretentious daughter of the people, whose funeral sermon, in after years, Archbishop Tenison did not disdain to preach, than from that " most profuse, imperious, and shameless of harlots," Barbara Palmer, or from that " curse of our nation," to use John Evelyn's words, Louise de Querouaille ? When the fury of the mob was roused against the latter, and in mistake they attacked the wrong coach, Nelly cried out, " Good gentlemen, don't hurt me—I'm the English " (or, according to another version, the " Protestant ") " harlot, not the French." After that, who could be hard upon her ?

She seems to have been a somewhat expensive toy ; though, considering the cost of the Duchesses of Cleveland and Ports-

mouth to the country, she does not appear to have been particularly rapacious. Burnet informs us that the Duke of Buckingham told him that Nelly, in the course of four years, obtained no less than £60,000 from the King. Nelly had the good sense not to ask for a peerage for herself; perhaps she had not those "personal virtues" which we are informed in Dugdale's Peerage were in part the reason for the elevation of Barbara Palmer to the rank of a duchess. Nelly, however, was anxious for the advancement of her elder son. According to one story, in a fit of jealousy at the provision made for Charles's other children, she threatened to throw the child out of the window, when the King cried out, "Save the Earl of Burford!" Another version has it that Nelly on one occasion called to the boy, "Come here, you little bastard," declaring that she had no better name to give him, whereupon Charles promised to create him Earl of Burford.

At the age of thirteen the child was further advanced to the title and dignity of Duke of St. Albans. He had, however, something more substantial than a title. This boy of thirteen was appointed Registrar to the Court of Chancery, and likewise Master Falconer, with remainder to his male heirs. A few years after he was appointed by William III. a Lord of the Bedchamber, and Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners—truly a most fitting appointment—an office which he held for many years. This first Duke further advanced his fortunes by a marriage with Diana, eldest daughter and eventually sole heiress of Aubrey de Vere, twentieth and last Earl of Oxford.

By this marriage the Duke of St. Albans united himself with one of the oldest houses in England. When, as a boy, I first came across a copy of Tennyson's earlier poems, I used to imagine that line in "*Lady Clara Vere de Vere*,"

"The daughter of a hundred Earls,"

to be an almost unpardonable stretch of poetic licence; but since then I have learned from that famous antiquary Leland that the pedigree of this family can be traced back through Meleager, that slew the Caledonian bear, and Diomed, who was at the siege of Troy, to the venerable patriarch Noah himself, so that the hundred earls may not be quite such a wide stretch of imagination after all. However, to leave the airy fields of speculation and return to solid earth, Collins says

that Alberick, or Aubrey, the direct ancestor of the Earls of Oxford, is spoken of in Domesday Book as being an Earl in the reign of Edward the Confessor. Mr. Wright, in his History of Essex, however, says that in the time of the Confessor, Hedingham belonged to a Saxon thane named Ulwine, and that this and thirteen other lordships in Essex were conferred by William the Conqueror upon Alberic de Vere, one of his generals, the first of the family who came into England, and who is supposed to have come from the town of Vere, in Zealand. The latter account is probably the correct one. It should be added that Alberic had lordships in several counties beside Essex. His son was appointed Great Chamberlain by Henry I., and his grandson was created Earl of Oxford by Henry II. Henceforth the De Veres appear to have taken a prominent part in public affairs, as often on the right side as the wrong. The second Earl was one of the evil counsellors of John, but the third Earl was excommunicated by the Pope for opposing that tyrant; while the fifth Earl was one of the patriotic barons who stood by Simon de Montfort in his gallant struggles for the liberties of England, and the seventh Earl was among the victors of Crecy and Poitiers. The ninth Earl, one of the worthless favourites of Richard II., was Viceroy of Ireland, and was created "Duke of Ireland," but his tyranny became so intolerable that he was accused of high treason, and, flying beyond the seas, died in great distress. The Veres were a Lancastrian house, and on the accession of Edward IV. the twelfth Earl and his eldest son were beheaded on Tower-hill, a fate which the next Earl narrowly escaped after the battle of Barnet. He lived, however, to contribute to the victory of Henry VII. at Bosworth, and to be ungratefully mulcted by him in the sum of 15,000 marks for keeping too many retainers at Hedingham. Oxford was at this time one of the richest noblemen in England, but the next heir dying without issue, the estates attached to the earldom became curtailed, all the lands not entailed going to three sisters of the Earl. The seventeenth Earl did his utmost to ruin what remained. He had vainly begged the life of his friend the Duke of Norfolk from Lord Chancellor Burghley, whose daughter he had married, and failing in success, he swore he would ruin his estate at Hedingham because it was his wife's jointure. He sold and wasted the best part of his inheritance, defaced the castle, and destroyed the park pales.

Hedingham passed subsequently to another branch of the family, and was ultimately sold. This Earl lived in the most extravagant style, and, we are told by Stow, rode into the City to his house by London Stone with eighty gentlemen in livery, and chains of gold about their necks, before him, and one hundred tall yeomen in livery following him. The twentieth Earl left four daughters; but the only one who married was the eldest, whose husband was the Duke of St. Albans.

None of the Beauclerks have greatly distinguished themselves, though they have furnished a dozen officers to the army and navy and four or five ministers of the Church, one of whom, thanks to his aristocratic connections, became Bishop of Hereford. The second Duke monopolised several court offices, beside the hereditary one, being Governor of Windsor Castle, Warden of Windsor Forest, and Lord of the Bedchamber. Of the succeeding Dukes there is nothing remarkable to be recorded till we come to the eighth, who, some years before he succeeded to the title, married the daughter and heiress of the Rev. R. Carter-Thelwall, owner of Redbourne Hall, near Brigg, in Lincolnshire. The lady died without issue, but the property remained in the Beauclerk family. Subsequently the Duke married the heiress of Mr. John Nelthorpe, of Little Grimsby Hall. From these two marriages are derived the 5,255 acres owned by the Duke of St. Albans in Lincolnshire. The ninth Duke married the widow of Thomas Coutts, the banker, better known as Miss Mellon the actress. By her he had no children, but by a second marriage he had the present Duke, who is a Liberal in politics, and, for a Duke, a man of considerable ability.

The Beauclerks have not been remarkable for their tax-eating propensities. Even in the dark days just before the first Reform Bill, I can only find one of them with a couple of places, whose annual value was £1,200. But they have held fast to the hereditary offices. In 1830 the Duke was receiving £1,372 per annum as Grand Falconer, and £640 as Hereditary Registrar of the Court of Chancery. At the present time I find that his Grace condescends to draw from the revenue the sum of £1,200 annually as Grand Falconer, and £965 more as compensation for the loss of office—I presume of the Chancery sinecure. It is really too bad that this sort of thing should continue indefinitely. For close upon two hundred years the nation has been paying rather over £2,000

a-year to the descendants of Charles and Nell Gwynne for doing nothing at all. Surely, £400,000, besides sundry lucrative places at diverse times, is quite sufficient. Does any monarch in these days require a Grand Falconer at all? Can he find any use whatever for such a functionary? In the reign of George IV. the Duke of St. Albans did attempt a momentary revival of falconry at Redbourne Hall, but it proved a miserable failure, and I very much doubt whether the present Duke would know a falcon if he saw one, unless it was painted on a public-house signboard with the name of the bird legibly written underneath. We cannot have a Monarch without a Court, and we cannot have a court, I suppose, without a Master of the Horse, and Lord Stewards, and Lords-in-Waiting, and it is evident that our great houses are too needy to do even Courtly duty for the bare honour of the thing, yet most of these courtiers have duties of some kind to perform. But what are the duties of a Grand Falconer, except to draw his salary? I admit that an estate of rather less than 10,000 acres is somewhat inadequate for a young Duke with an increasing family; but there are Colonial Governorships and other means of eking out a living. Besides, it sets such a bad example to the lower orders. We are not without hopes of entirely abolishing out-door relief before long; but how could a nobleman vote in the House of Lords for such a proposal when he himself was in the receipt of out-door relief to the tune of £2,000 per annum?

The Wodehouses.

WHEN the Agricultural Labourers' movement spread like wildfire through the Midland and Eastern Counties a few years ago, there was no county where the labourers fought more sturdily and obtained greater success than Norfolk. The farmers were wild with rage, and not content with forming counter associations, they held several meetings with the object of giving increased stringency to the operation of the Poor-Law. Of course they protested that the movement was not dictated by any motive of revenge, but on that point observers took their protest for what it was worth, and formed their own opinion. Going about in Norfolk, as I did at that time, I formed an opinion anything but favourable to those who took the lead in the matter. More than one conference of Poor-Law Guardians was held, and it was determined that as the labourers had screwed their wages up to the extravagant rate of 12s., 13s., and 14s. per week, an attempt should be made to do away with outdoor relief, and married men with families should be compelled to contribute to the support of their aged parents who happened to be in the workhouse. The outdoor relief question could not, however, be settled by a conference of Poor-Law Guardians; and though a few poor wretches were dragged before the magistrates and put in prison for not helping to keep their parents when they could hardly keep their own children, I believe it was found that the game was not really worth the candle. The man who presided at these conferences of Poor-Law Guardians was an ex-Liberal Minister, the Earl of Kimberley, formerly Lord Wodehouse, owner of 10,800 acres of land in Norfolk rental £15,188.

Although the Wodehouse Peerage only dates from 1797, the Wodehouses are an ancient family, of whose history they have no reason to be ashamed. Long before many of the proudest houses in England were known to fame, Wodehouses of knightly fame were found fighting side by side with

the warrior kings. Whether they were of Norman or Saxon extraction I know not. The author of their ancient rhymed pedigree, alluding to a tradition that they came originally from Woodhouse, in Yorkshire says:—

“ I leave unscanned their North-west ancestry
Unevidenced, though in the pedigree,
How that Sir Bertram, lord of Woodhouse Tower,
Compounded with the Norman Conqueror.”

Blomefield, the historian of Norfolk, however, is of opinion that the family name is derived from a tenement and lands called Wodehouse, in Windham, in that county. If we may trust to this authority, the Wodehouses were to be found almost in any place where fighting was to be done. A knight of that name was at Bayeux, at Caen, and in the Scottish campaigns of Edward I.; and a Sir John de Wodehouse distinguished himself at Agincourt, the name of which hard-fought field still appears on the family coat of arms; another Wodehouse, who raised and kept two hundred followers at his own charge during the Wars of the Roses, was knighted at Grafton Field, near Tewkesbury; and yet another fell fighting against the Scots at Musselburgh. The son of this last, Roger, was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, who honoured him with one of her expensive royal visits at Kimberley. The throne which was erected for her at the time is, I believe, still kept at the family seat as a memorial of her visit. Philip, the son of Sir Roger, was knighted by the Earl of Essex at the capture of Cadiz, and subsequently was one of the first baronets created by James I., an honour which he appears to have been rather reluctant to accept, he himself and so many of his ancestors having won their spurs on the battle-field, and valuing such honours before the hereditary titles of mere carpet knights. The second baronet was a member of the Long Parliament, and appears to have been a moderate and obscure member of the Puritan party. Since that time the Wodehouses have not come much to the front, either as statesmen, soldiers, or even courtiers. Apparently the present Earl of Kimberley, who gained two steps in the peerage in 1866, is the only Wodehouse who has risen to the dignity of a Cabinet Minister.

Most of the landed property which the Wodehouses possess has been acquired by a number of fortunate marriages. Kimberley, their chief seat, was acquired by the marriage

of Sir John Wodehouse to the heiress of Sir Thomas Fastolf, one of the courtiers of Henry IV. The next heir was the knight of Agincourt, to whose lady Henry V. presented two valuable necklaces (still in the possession of the family), besides standing sponsor for her eldest son. A little later the heir of the Wodehouses married Constance Geddinge, of Icklingham, another Norfolk heiress, and his son married the heiress of Edward Sweetyng. The next Wodehouse (Sir Thomas) got into difficulties through his extravagance, and mortgaged Litcham and other lands to Sir Roger Townshend, of Raynham, ancestor of the Marquis Townshend. But he found a new way to pay old debts by marrying the daughter of his creditor, and thus the lands were preserved to the family. The father of the first Lord Wodehouse married another Norfolk heiress, the daughter of Sir Edward Bacon, of Garboldisham. The second Lord Wodehouse also married a Norfolk heiress, the daughter of Mr. John Norris, M.P., of Witton Park and Withchingham. Taking these half-dozen marriages into consideration, the wonder is that the Wodehouses have not accumulated more than 10,800 acres of land by this time. It should be mentioned that the Wodehouses have had peculiarly intimate connection with Norwich Cathedral, of which more than one of the family has been high steward. I have occasionally come across references to leases of the cathedral lands to the Wodehouse family, but can only imagine their character by the manner in which other cathedral lands have been leased at various times. Unfortunately, it is not possible to bring to light these hidden things of darkness. That in another way the Wodehouses have profited largely by their connection with the Church it is by no means difficult to prove.

That excellent prelate, the Bishop of Manchester, was recently engaged in the ungracious task of excusing as far as possible the sale of livings in the Church of England. His lordship might be much more usefully occupied in cutting at the evil root and branch, and at the same time he might profitably devote some attention to the evils attendant upon the possession of livings by great landowners. I admit it has its advantages of a worldly kind, but then the Great Head of the Church has said that His Kingdom is not of this world. The Wodehouse family will furnish an excellent typical case. They have, or had till recently, eleven family livings, and they cer

tainly have not neglected to turn them to their own advantage, as such families almost invariably do. I have of late become somewhat familiar with the use made of family livings as a provision for younger sons, but I hardly recollect a case in which the Church has received any distinguished service from this class of men. Then, when we remember how largely places in the Church are filled by men whose sole recommendation is the accident of their birth, thus shutting out from the prizes she has to offer the majority of the hard-working clergy who have nothing to recommend them but many years of faithful service, we cannot but feel indignant that the revenue of the Church of England should be used as outdoor relief for the aristocracy. What would be said if a large proportion of the stipendiary magistrates, of the County Court judges, of the revising barristers, and other legal officers were always the sons and nephews of noble lords? The case is not so bad as it used to be, but it is quite bad enough still, and will never be thoroughly reformed while private patronage exists.

Let us turn to the clerical history of the Wodehouse family. I find that of the sons and descendants of the father of the first Lord Wodehouse no less than sixteen have been in Holy Orders, to say nothing of half-a-dozen daughters who have married clergymen. It is unnecessary to give in detail the careers of all these; we will take a few as samples of the remainder. First there was the Honourable and Rev. Armine Wodehouse, son of the first Lord, who held Barnham Broom Bixton, and Kimberley, West Lexham, and Litcham, Norfolk livings procured for or presented to him by his father, whose united present annual value is £1,510, with a house attached to each. He held these in 1823—how long before I know not—and died in 1873; so that, unless he resigned some of them before his death, he must have netted from the Church £75,500, besides five houses to live in. It should be borne in mind that, according to the Treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty, the average value of parsonages is £1,800, or something like £100 per annum. Next, let us take the Rev. C. N. Wodehouse, brother of the first Lord. In 1823 I find him Prebend of Norwich, of which he was afterwards Archdeacon, also Rector of Morningthorpe—£242 a year and a house. He died in 1870. Next there was the Rev. Thomas Wodehouse, a nephew of the first lord, Canon of Wells, Rector of Stourmouth (£399 and a house) and of Norton (£306

and a house). Then there was the Rev. Nathaniel, Vicar of Dulverton and of Work—united value £692 and two houses. Then there was the Hon. and Rev. William, a son of the first Lord, with two family livings in Norfolk—Hingham (£1,260 and a house) and Carleton Forehoe (£150). These five must have drawn from the Church in money and money's worth about a quarter of a million of money. The remainder of the offshoots of the Wodehouse family have been for the most part provided for in the Army, Navy, Colonial, and Diplomatic Services.

The Legges.



HAVE noticed that occasionally, when the Conservatives of Birmingham—whose main hope of success seems to lie in robbing honest men of their votes—have a field-day in favour of sectarian education, or the ecclesiastical ascendancy of the Church of England, they delight to place in the presidential chair a certain Lord Dartmouth. But for that, most people would be ignorant of the noble Lord's existence. Recently I saw a paragraph circulating through the Press giving the substance of a letter written by his Lordship expressing his regret that he could not attend a Tory dinner in Staffordshire, and congratulating the Government upon the Berlin Treaty. Can there be in this country any rational person, beyond Lord Dartmouth's tenants, that cares two straws about Lord Dartmouth's view upon the Eastern or any other question? Is there any daily journal that would take the trouble to print Lord Dartmouth's letters if they were only signed plain Legge? I think not. I turn, then, to Lord Dartmouth's pedigree. Possessing no small reverence for the past, I am inclined to listen with respect to the views of a man whose direct ancestors signed Magna Charta, promoted the Reformation Settlement at the accession of Elizabeth, withstood the tyranny of Charles I., or risked their lives and fortunes in the Revolution of 1688. But when I turn to the Legges I find that the country owes them a great deal less than nothing, and that they owe the country much. Lord Dartmouth, like the son of the Marquis of Exeter, is probably a Conservative by birth. His ancestors were Conservatives, and if their hereditary wisdom had prevailed, the Government of England would at this moment have been as despotic as that of Russia.

About the early and obscure history of the Legges I am not much concerned. They may or may not have been descended from a noble Venetian house. They are probably descended from a rich citizen of London who lent money to one of the

Plantagenet Kings. But at any rate the immediate founder of the house was a man of no particular note or substance when he came over from Ireland, and set up in the courtier business, in the reign of Charles I. This William Legge was Page, Keeper of the King's Wardrobe, and Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the tyrant, and appears to have been a by no means clever man, though he had the virtue of remaining faithful to Charles in the days of his adversity. After the Restoration he became Treasurer and Superintendent of the Ordnance, with general's pay, and Hasted, in his "*History of Kent*," further informs us that "he had many lucrative and honourable employments conferred on him, beside the grant of a pension and lands of considerable value." He died at his house in the Minories, which was conveniently near the Tower of London, and was buried, as also was his son, in the old Trinity Chapel in the Minories, which has long since been pulled down.

George Legge, his eldest son, obtained rapid promotion through the interest of the father. Pepys tells us that the Duke of York complained that he was made a captain after only one voyage. However, if his fulsome biographer may be trusted, he turned out a brave and skilful officer, and did good service in several sea-fights with the Dutch, for which he was certainly amply rewarded. He was appointed Lieutenant and Master-General of the Ordnance, obtained the colonelcy of a regiment, was made Master-General of the Horse and a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Duke of York, and I know not what else. The "*Peerages*" mention as his principal achievement the destruction of Tangier. It must not be supposed, however, that this work was analogous to the bombardment of Algiers in the last century. Tangier was our own property. It came to us as a marriage portion with Catherine of Braganza, Queen of Charles II. Burnet says:—"After the King had kept Tangier about twenty years, and had been at a vast charge in making a mole before it, in which several sets of undertakers had failed indeed in the main designs, but had succeeded well in enriching themselves, and the work was now brought near perfection, which seemed to give us the key of the Mediterranean; he, to deliver himself of that charge, sent Lord Dartmouth with a fleet to destroy all the works, and to bring home all the men." For this brilliant exploit Legge received a present of £10,000 from the King, besides several grants and charters. One of these was the right to hold a fair on

Blackheath. Legge, out of the profits of his numerous offices, had a few years before purchased "the manor with the rectory, church, and parsonage and advowson, of the Vicarage of Lewisham and their appurts," and Blackheath being for the most part situated within the limits of this manor, he obtained the charter to hold a fair thereon twice a-year—a fair at one time very popular, and a visit to which Evelyn describes in his memoirs. George Legge was created Baron Dartmouth, and was one of the principal advisers of James II. His name appears with those of Jeffreys, Castlemaine, Sunderland, and other ignoble nobles, on the warrant consigning the Seven Bishops to the Tower, the inside of which he himself, like Jeffreys, saw not long afterwards. Dartmouth commanded James's fleet when it vainly attempted to intercept the Prince of Orange; but he refused to be a party to sending James's infant son out of the country, and shortly after took the oath of allegiance to William. He was, however, as a precautionary measure, deprived of his offices, and then he communicated information to the exiled King at St. Germans, and even offered to join him, if he was put in command of a French fleet for the purpose of destroying his country's liberties. The result was that he was thrown into the Tower, where he shortly afterwards died.

Of the succeeding Dartmouths there is not much to be said. The second Baron held office as Secretary of State and as Lord Privy Seal in Harley's High Church and Tory Ministry in the reign of Anne, and was promoted to an Earldom. One of his sons, a man of mediocre talents, became a Whig Chancellor of the Exchequer, and was created Baron Stawell; a peerage which died out with his eldest son. The grandson of the first Earl succeeded his grandfather in the title, and was favourably spoken of by Cowper as—

"The peer who wears a coronet and prays."

This amiable man had the misfortune to be Colonial Minister when the difficulty with the American Colonies came to a head. The blunders of his predecessors and the infatuated folly of the King himself are more to be condemned than Dartmouth's incapacity to grapple with a great difficulty. Even in Boston, at the time when the dispute over the Tea Duty reached a crisis, Dartmouth was spoken of with respect. However, it is safe to affirm that if he had not been a lord he would never

have been a minister. So end for the present the inglorious annals of Legge statesmanship.

The Legges, not being a wealthy family until quite recently, have had to send their younger sons into the various services. The Army, the Navy, the Colonies, and the Civil Services have always been well stocked with them. In 1830 I find one of them drawing £1,400 a-year as a Commissioner of the Customs, and another £1,200 as a Deputy-Comptroller of the Navy. But as the Legges had several family livings, not a few of them turned their attention to the Church. The second Earl had two sons in holy orders, one of whom was Bishop of Oxford, the other rector of two parishes and prebendary of Winchester. This last had three sons and one grandson also in Holy Orders, beside two granddaughters who married clergymen. Their clerical history I cannot now trace; but, coming to the third Earl, I find that he had a son who in 1831 was presented to the fat family living of Lewisham (£1,100 a-year and a house), which he still holds. A son of the fourth Earl has been for the last eleven years Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham (£300). The former vicarage carries with it the right of presentation to two other livings, and the latter vicarage to a third. The clerical patronage of the Legges is considerably above £5,000, and they evidently know how to use it. I can admire and appreciate the zeal with which such men as Mr. Thomas Hughes defend Church Establishments, but it is difficult to believe in the pure disinterestedness of people to whom existing arrangements mean a sum of between £5,000 and £6,000 per annum, perpetually available for the support of the poor relations of the family who choose to go into Holy Orders.

Beside the Lewisham property, which must have increased enormously in value of late years, the Earl of Dartmouth owns—

14,723	acres	in	Yorkshire,
4,699	„	„	Stafford,
2,190	„	„	Bucks,

acquired mostly by marriage and purchase. One member of the family married the heiress of Sir Henry Archbold, of Abbots Bromley, Staffordshire; another the heiress of Sir Arthur Kaye, of Woodsome, Yorkshire.

The Blighs.



MORE than once I have been roundly abused as a disguised Papist, because I have not hesitated to expose the seamy side of the English Reformation, for there are some people who fail to see that the theological issues involved therein are not in the least affected by the manner in which confiscated ecclesiastical property was devoured by greedy courtiers. I have shown how one great house after another was built up out of the spoil, and I have been anxious to discover whether any of the class who profited so much by the change suffered anything to bring it about. Could not I find any martyr blood? I know that to this high calling "not many mighty, not many noble are called," but I have been in the hope that I might come across some noble house one of whose sons had been enrolled in "the noble army of martyrs." Alas! they were all ready to give up or conceal their faith at the bidding of Mary—Bloody Mary, as our sturdy Protestant fathers used fitly to call her—provided she would only allow them to retain their ill-gotten lands in quietness. A few days ago, however, I thought I had found my quest. I was informed in a newspaper that the son of the Earl of Darnley, of Cobham Hall, Kent, had been selected as the Conservative candidate for Rochester. At once my mind reverted to that stout old Lollard, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, who, in the reign of Henry V., was hung in chains and roasted over a slow fire. Could it be possible that the Earl of Darnley was descended, directly or indirectly, from the first Protestant leader? I turn to that Family Bible of Fashion—Burke's Peerage—and the expectation vanishes. I find that for nearly two hundred years after Oldcastle's death the male ancestors of Lord Darnley were utterly unknown to fame; that, in fact, the blood of a London adventurer and of a branch of the worthless Stuart race unite in the modern house of Darnley.

After the most diligent search, I cannot find that the Blighs

have done anything remarkable except to acquire 9,934 acres in Kent, and 28,830 acres in Meath (5,414 of the latter being in the possession of Mr. Edward Bligh), nearly all of which was neither won by the sword nor honestly purchased. The Earl of Darnley is Hereditary High Steward of Gravesend, where he sometimes takes the chair at religious meetings, and his brother, who is a Low Church vicar, has become prominent as the promoter of a Revision of the Prayer Book in an Evangelical direction. The Earl, I believe, bears an amiable reputation, but a few years ago he made himself disagreeably conspicuous by giving a late mayor of Gravesend a direct intimation that it was time he should cease to be a Darnley tenant when he was no longer disposed to do the bidding of the Lord of the Darnley estates.

We may be sure that until 1641 the Blighs were utterly obscure, otherwise we should be sure to have a long pedigree—more or less doubtful—given in the Peerages. As it is, we find that in 1641 John Bligh was a simple citizen of London, who went out as an adventurer to Ireland. What came of his adventure we have already seen from the number of acres which the Blighs now possess in Meath. In Burke the record stands thus:—"John Bligh (son of William Bligh, of Plymouth), a citizen of London, was employed as agent of the adventurers for the forfeited estates by the Rebellion of 1641, and in that capacity arrived in Ireland during the usurpation of Cromwell, when he became an adventurer to a large extent." At the Restoration he displayed a convenient readiness to change his colours, and became a member of the Irish Parliament, as also were his son and grandson. Having helped to confiscate the land, what more natural than that they should assist in making those repressive laws by which the Irish people were scourged almost to madness?

John Bligh the second, grandson of the founder of the family, greatly advanced the fortunes of the house by a fortunate marriage, by means of which the Blighs became possessed of the Kentish estates. Cobham Hall and Park, between Gravesend and Rochester, are well known to many Londoners. The Hall used to be, and, I believe, still is, thrown open to visitors at certain hours, for which the Blighs deserve some credit, as it is one of the most interesting old houses near London, the wings having been built in the reign of Elizabeth, and the central portion a generation or two later by Inigo Jones.

For some centuries the Cobham estates were in the possession of the Cobhams, Lords Cobham, but early in the reign of James I., the last lord, a poor, weak creature, became implicated in what was called Raleigh's conspiracy. The confused statements extracted from this pitiful personage served to answer the double purpose of condemning Raleigh, the enemy of the minister, Cecil, and of affording James I. a fine confiscated estate for one of his favourites. Cobham was committed to the Tower, where he would have been starved but for a faithful old menial servant who fed him on scraps, and, being subsequently released, died in great poverty. After his attainder an Act of Parliament was passed to confirm his possessions to the Crown, and to render valid all grants that should be made of them by the King. With his hungry swarm of Scotch favourites around him James was not long in availing himself of the Act; for in the tenth year of his reign he granted the manor of Cobham, with Cobham Hall and other estates of the Cobhams, to Ludovick Stuart, Duke of Lennox, whom he also created Duke of Richmond, in the English Peerage, and appointed Master of the Household and First Gentleman of the Bedchamber. The nephew and successor of this Duke was equally fortunate, for James married him to the daughter of his favourite, Buckingham, and gave him £20,000 with her. The last Duke of Richmond and Lennox having died in financial difficulties, Cobham Hall was sold to pay his debts.

The purchaser was Sir Joseph Williamson, at one time a Secretary of State, who had married a sister of the Duke. Williamson left by will two-thirds of his estates to his wife, and one-third, consisting of the Kentish property, to Mrs. Mary Hornsby, his servant. And now the Blighs step in. John Bligh had married the granddaughter, by a former marriage, of Williamson's wife, and he made an attempt to set aside the will. After long and vexatious litigation, the suit was compromised in 1731 by Bligh paying Mrs. Hornsby a sum of £16,666, he obtaining possession of the Cobham estates. It is not difficult to understand this transaction. It is evident that such a sum would not have been paid unless Mrs. Hornsby had had a good case. It is equally evident that it was a most inadequate sum for an estate of nine thousand acres and one of the finest mansions in Kent. But Bligh was a great Irish landlord; he had been recently created Baron Clifton, Vis.

count and then Earl of Darnley ; while, on the other side, was this poor woman, with nothing but right on her side, wearied out by costly litigation.

Since that time the Blighs have rested content with what they have gained—not quite though. The last Earl but one, in 1829, claimed the Dukedom of Lennox, on the ground that Charles II. was heir of the last Duke, and that on the death of the Cardinal of York the legitimate Stuart line had died out, and that he was now heir general. The House of Lords, however, did not pronounce in his favour. Probably the Blighs still cherish this ambition, and they may yet gain their object in another way. Lord Beaconsfield is lavish in giving titles as rewards for party political services. If there are only enough Conservative working men in the constituency for which the son of the Earl of Darnley is a candidate, they may materially assist in promoting the descendants of John Bligh, the London adventurer, to the dukedom they covet. The family motto of the Blighs is "*Respice finem*"—"Look to the end"; and they might have added, "never mind the means."

The Tollenraches.

THE Earls of Dysart have at different times called themselves Murray, Tollemache, Manners, and Talmash. Considering that bastard children take the name of their mother, it would be impossible at the present time to say what their proper name should be ; however, they have a legal right now to the name of Tollemache, which sounds much more aristocratic than Brown, Jones, or Robinson. We have already seen families rise to wealth and rank by peculiar means of various kinds, but there is a singularity about the rise of this house which demands a passing notice. The first step up the ladder of fortune in their case was the birching of the founder's posteriors. Among the Scottish vultures that preyed upon England like a dead carcase at the accession of James I. was a certain parson, named William Murray. The Rev. William Murray had the good luck to be appointed Preceptor to Prince Charles, and William Murray, his son, obtained the honourable post of whipping-boy. No doubt young Murray considered his case a hard one when he had to suffer vicarious punishment for the faults of the youthful Prince ; but in the end he was more than recompensed for his sufferings. From whipping-boy he rose to be page, and from page to be Gentleman of the Bed-chamber, and particular confidant of his master. I cannot find that he rendered him any important service, and as Burnet says, "it was generally believed that he betrayed the most important of the King's secrets to his enemies." A Committee of the House of Commons requested the Monarch to remove "that vile person" from his councils ; but Charles retained Murray about him, and towards the close of his life created him Earl of Dysart and Baron Huntingtower in the Peerage of Scotland. It does not appear, however, that Murray's title was ever recognised. In the days of his master's prosperity he had obtained more substantial rewards. For instance, in 1637 Murray obtained a lease of the manors of Ham and

Petersham at a nominal rent. Ham, Petersham, and Shene, or Richmond, had been part of the provision made for Anne of Cleves at her divorce from Henry VIII., and at her death had again reverted to the Crown. At Ham was a mansion recently built, called Ham House, belonging to Sir Thomas Vavasour, which was built out of the profits of the sale of fish to the Londoners. Sir Thomas did not carry on the trade like an honest fishmonger or costermonger; he obtained a monopoly, so that no one could sell certain kinds of fish without his licence, and thus the price was sent up enormously. Murray bought this house.

Murray's daughter, Elizabeth, was a clever, intriguing, profligate woman. Jesse says that she used to boast to her second husband that, when he was taken prisoner after the Battle of Worcester, "she saved his life by submitting to the familiarities of Oliver Cromwell." I can quite believe she said so, and that she would willingly have done so; but it needs far better testimony than hers to believe such a thing of the Great Protector. However, she was busy with political intrigue, both in the time of Cromwell and in that of Charles II. From the latter she obtained a new patent of nobility as Countess of Dysart, and a grant of the Ham property at the nominal rent of £16 9s.—a comfortable, easy rent for grounds which had one avenue of trees a third of a mile long, and another that extended for nearly a mile. She had married Sir Lionel Tollemache, by whom she had children, and she had the right, by her patent, to nominate any one of them to succeed her in her title. Upon her first husband's death she married the Earl of Lauderdale, with whom her relations had long been of such an equivocal character that he was separated from his first wife in consequence. Soon after the marriage Lauderdale was created a Duke. By all accounts, he was one of the vilest men of that vile age. Horace Walpole says: "He was such a dog that the least honest man must have been driven to detest him." He was the Lauderdale of the notorious "Cabal," who governed Scotland with boot and thumb-screw, with musket and gibbet; the man whom Macaulay fitly describes as "the most dishonest member of the whole Cabal," and "a savage old tyrant." Ham House was fitted and furnished for this precious pair at an enormous expense—at the expense, too, of the King, or, more properly, of the people of England. "The gains of Lauderdale," says

Macaulay, "were enormous ; the more than Italian luxury of Ham House, with its busts, fountains, and aviaries, were among the many signs which indicated what was the shortest road to boundless wealth." As for the Duchess, Burnet tells us that "she took upon herself to determine everything ; she sold all places, and was wanting in no method that could bring her money, which she lavished with a most profuse vanity ;" and again, "Not content with the great appointments they had, she set herself by all possible methods to raise money." I need say no more of this modern Ahab and Jezebel. But it always moves me to scornful laughter when the descendants of men and women, who are living to this day on the products of the fraud and peculation of their ancestors—fraud and peculation compared with which the doings of Boss Tweed and the Tammany Ring are a trifle—presume to lecture the American people upon political corruption as the peculiar vice of Republics. Truly the great house of Pecksniff is well represented in the British Peerage.

At the death of the Duchess of Lauderdale, her eldest son by Sir Lionel Tollemache succeeded to her title and to the Ham property. The Tollemaches were an old Suffolk family of Saxon descent. The name is supposed to signify a bell-ringer. In the reign of Henry VI. Sir Lionel Tollemache, having married an heiress who owned Helmingham, in Suffolk, made that place his seat. His grandson obtained considerable grants of confiscated church lands from Henry VIII., including the manor and rectory of Wandsen, the manor and rectory of Le Church Hey, and the manors of Bury Hall Willows and Overhall. A succeeding Sir Lionel, who was High Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk, entertained Queen Elizabeth at Helmingham in one of her progresses. His son was subsequently created a Baronet by James I. It was the third Baronet (nearly all of them were Sir Lionels) who married the Countess Dysart, who was afterwards Duchess of Lauderdale. The third Earl had fifteen children, and yet, by a strange fatality, in the next generation, for want of a male heir, the Peerage passed to one of his daughters and her issue. Of his five sons who grew up to manhood, two inherited the Earldom, but died without children ; a third was killed by a fall from a masthead, a fourth lost his life in a duel, and the fifth perished in a shipwreck.


The title then passed to a daughter of the third Earl. She

was married to Mr. John Manners, of Grantham Grange. John Manners was the bastard son of Lord William Manners, whose father, the Duke of Rutland, seems to have provided for him more liberally than is the wont of Peers in dealing with their younger sons. I have already described how much of the wealth of the Manners family is due to the confiscation of Church lands, so it is unnecessary to travel over the same ground. Lord William appears to have increased his possessions by purchases, and at his death his property went to his natural son, John, who assumed the name of Manners. The Countess brought the title, John Manners the land; and now the Earl of Dysart boasts of 8,420 acres in Leicester and 18,025 in Lincoln.

Lord Huntingtower, the eldest son of the Countess, died in the lifetime of his mother, but the extraordinary election transactions in which he was engaged deserve to be placed upon record. I forbear from expressing any opinion upon his conduct, preferring rather to leave the facts in all their naked hideousness. Lord Huntingtower had purchased a number of small houses in the little town of Ilchester in Somerset, which at that time returned two members to the House of Commons. Obviously the property was bought for electioneering purposes, and most abominably was his lordship's object carried out. It soon became a desperate struggle between bribery and intimidation, and, bad as is the man who bribes, he is pure as snow compared with the man who intimidates. In the year 1802 most of the voters were bribed with £30 each, and so Lord Huntingtower's candidates were defeated. In order to prevent a similar accident in future this considerate landlord actually pulled down 240 houses, and built a large workhouse for the reception of the electors. He then let the workhouse to the parish, the inmates thus being disqualified from voting, though not receiving parish relief. There these poor people lived till 1818, but the remaining electors, proving equally obstinate, and returning two members once more in opposition to his wish, Lord Huntingtower, in revenge, turned more than 160 of the inhabitants of his workhouse into the highways in the depth of winter. Old men, infants in arms, and women on the point of lying-in were thus rendered homeless, and for the remainder of the winter had to camp out by the roadside, with nothing to shelter them but a few hurdles covered with straw.

At the next election the majority of the few remaining electors again polled against Lord Huntingtower's two relatives. The rector leased his glebe to one of the successful candidates, who built houses thereon, and the Corporation let some borough land on a lease of four lives for a similar purpose. Thus the power of the Tollemaches was effectually broken. Comment is needless. But it is surprising that in the ranks of the working classes are found some who can be induced to vote for the political heirs of such tyrants as Lord Huntingtower. The late Earl of Dysart, whose death has been very recently reported, was a person whose eccentricity bordered upon madness.

The Campbells.

“ KNOW of no family in Europe of this eminency,” says Woodrow, in his “History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland,” “whom the Lord has so much honoured as this of Argyll. To all persons of consideration and reflection the Marquis and his son both shine brightly as martyrs for their religion and their country, and it is beyond contradiction that the Lord owned them both, and sealed a deep sense of his favour upon their souls.” I doubt not that there are not a few Scotchmen in London who know much more of the Campbells than I do, but I beg them to remember that I write as an Englishman for Englishmen, and that my main object is less to give a detailed history of this illustrious house than to express the warm admiration of a Southron for the eminent services which the House of Argyll has rendered to the cause of Protestantism and liberty. I think that no one can fairly charge me with a bias towards the Whigs simply as Whigs, for I have not shrunk from telling disagreeable truths of the great houses of either party. To me it matters no more that the Duke of Argyll is a Whig than that his eldest son has married a Princess. As Dukes go, the house of Argyll is not wealthy—perhaps that is all the more to its honour. Its estates are not so situated that it is enabled heavily to tax industry to support its luxury. The mere acreage of the Argyll estates—168,315 acres in Argyll and 6,799 in Dumbarton—would give an exaggerated idea of its wealth; but Argyll is far from being a fertile county, and it lies remote from the industrial centres. The rental is £50,843. The Duke has still great territorial influence, and his castle at Inverary, with its extensive plantations, has become famous; but the crowning glory of the Campbells is that they have been true leaders of the people, and that more than once their blood has been bravely shed upon the scaffold for the popular cause. Though the eldest son seems to be nothing more than a third-rate poet and the husband of a Princess, the

fifth and youngest son, in his recent candidature for Argyllshire has undoubtedly given fair promise of upholding the ancient fame of the race.

As to the agrarian history of the Campells I can say but little. Speaking of Inverary itself, the "Statistical Account of Scotland" says: "By what right, whether of purchase, or the sword, or by grant from the Sovereign, the Argylls first obtained possession here is uncertain, and it was not till a recent date that the whole parish became their property." Of the iniquitous manner in which the Highland clansmen were dispossessed of their lands, and the Highland chiefs acquired possession, I have already spoken when dealing with the Sutherland family, and it is unnecessary to travel over the same ground. As late as the reign of James II., Macaulay says, speaking of the unfortunate chief of the Campbells, "Though persecuted and a fugitive, he was still, in some sense, the most powerful subject in the British dominions. In wealth, even before his attainder, he was probably inferior, not only to the great English nobles, but to some of the opulent squires of Kent and Norfolk. But his patriarchal authority made him truly formidable. He had only to show himself on the coast of Lorne, and an army would in a few days gather round him. The force which, in favourable circumstances, he could bring into the field, amounted to five thousand fighting men, devoted to his service, accustomed to the use of target and broadsword, not afraid to encounter regular troops even in the open plain."

"Eight centuries ago," Burke tells us, "Gillespick Campbell acquired by marriage with an heiress the lordship of Lochow, in Argyllshire." One of his descendants, Sir Colin (almost all the Argyll family are either Colins, Archibalds, or Johns), having distinguished himself in fighting and in acquisition of lands, was termed MacCullum More, or MacCullum the Great, a Gaelic appellation, which his descendants have ever since retained. From that time forward the Campbells played a distinguished part in Scottish history. Sir Niel, son of Sir Colin, was with Robert Bruce in all his battles to the great triumph at Bannockburn. Sir Colin, son of Niel, captured Dunoon Castle from the English on behalf of King David Bruce, and thenceforward his sons became hereditary governors of that fortress. A succeeding Colin (second Lord Campbell) married the heiress of the Lords of Lorne, with whom his ancestors had been at feud for generations. The names

Lochow, Dunoon, Lorne, show how the heads of the great Campbell clan were all this time growing in power and prosperity. The Campbell who married the heiress of Lorne was created Earl of Argyll. The second Earl fell fighting at Flodden. The fourth Earl is entitled to honourable mention as the first nobleman in Scotland who avowed his adherence to Protestantism. When the Covenant was first signed in 1547, among the first names were those of Argyll and Lorne. It set forth that the signatories had entered into a solemn promise, in the presence of the majesty of God and His congregation, to set forward and establish, with their whole power and substance, and their very lives, His blessed Word; to labour to have faithful ministers, to defend them at the peril of their lives and goods against all tyranny; and it concluded by denouncing vengeance against all the superstition, idolatry, and abominations of the Roman Church. Two years after, when the strength of the Protestant Party had compelled the wicked Queen (Mary) to come to a truce with them, the Lords of the Congregation framed a new bond or covenant, in which they promised in the presence of God to spare neither labour, nor life, nor substance in maintaining the liberty of the whole brethren against whatever person should trouble them for the cause of religion, or any other cause thereon pending.

Coming a little later down, to the time when Charles I. and Archbishop Laud attempted to force their "Black Prelacy" upon Scotland, in 1638, we arrive at that memorable scene in the Greyfriars Churchyard at Edinburgh, when the solemn League and Covenant was renewed. Mr. Burton says that "the Highlanders through the vast western districts where Argyll's influence prevailed followed their chief with the fervid vehemence of their race." Of this Argyll, the great Marquis who played such an important part in the Civil Wars, it would be impossible here to speak at length. Suffice it to say that he sat in the Westminster Assembly, that after the death of Charles I. he crowned Charles II., taking strict guarantees for the rights of the Presbyterian Church, that after Cromwell's victories he accepted the Protectorate, and concluded an amicable treaty with Major-General Deane, one of Cromwell's Lieutenants, and that he was an assenting party to the Restoration. He went up to London, in full reliance upon his safety, to pay his court to the miserable cur to whom he had once given the crown of Scotland, but was refused an audience, was

arrested, thrown into the Tower, shipped off to Edinburgh, tried for high treason, and condemned to death. His foes would have found a difficulty in condemning him, but that the traitor Monk, with inconceivable baseness, forwarded to Scotland letters which Argyll had written when Monk was in command of the Republican forces. Well might Mr. Burton say that "the blow was to be struck rather for what he might and could do than for what he had done." So died the great Marquis, a martyr to his love of freedom and Presbyterian Protestantism.

In 1663 the eldest son of the Marquis was restored to his estates and to the ancient earldom. For twenty years he seems to have pursued a temporising policy, complying with the prelatial tyranny so far as to give grave offence to the Presbyterian party. But when the Duke of York (afterwards James II.) assumed the Government of Scotland, Argyll was brought to trial, and sentenced to death on such frivolous pretexts that Halifax said to the King, "We should not hang a dog in England on the grounds on which my Lord Argyll has been sentenced." Argyll escaped to Holland, and in exile he bitterly repented his defection from the Covenant. When the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion was projected, it was arranged that Argyll and others should make a descent upon the coast of Scotland. Hampered by divided authority, Argyll found his plans thwarted, and the insurrection miserably failed; Argyll himself was taken prisoner, and conveyed to Edinburgh. In captivity he bore himself nobly. In vain he was loaded with insults and threatened with torture; nothing could induce him to betray his fellow-patriots. Calmly he slept his last sleep, and when he rose, calling for pen and ink, he wrote to his wife, "Dear heart, God is unchangeable; He hath always been good to me, and no place alters it. Forgive me all my faults; and now comfort thyself in Him, in whom only true comfort is to be found. The Lord be with thee, bless and comfort thee, my dearest. Adieu." Arrived at the scaffold, he mounted it with a firm step, and addressed the people in a speech breathing the spirit of a serene and noble faith. One of the time-serving Prelatic clergy said, "My Lord dies a Protestant." "Yes," added the Earl, "and not only a Protestant, but with a heart-hatred of Popery, of Prelacy, and of all Superstition!" Then, kneeling down, he submitted his neck to the axe of "the maiden," the ancient guillotine of

Scotland. So died the ninth Earl of Argyll—a man whose death was nobler and braver than his life.

The attainder was reversed soon after the Revolution, and the son again succeeded the father in the estates and title, and in 1701 was created Duke of Argyll. His son, true to the traditions of his family, served under William III. in his various campaigns in defence of the Protestant cause in Europe. Later he fought under Marlborough at Ramillies, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet, and at the sieges of Ostend, Menin, Mons, Ghent, Lille, and Tournay. In the latter part of Queen Anne's reign he opposed the Jacobite Tories, and was dismissed from all his employments; but when Anne lay on her death-bed, he appeared, unsummoned, at the Privy Council, and added considerable strength to the adherents of the House of Hanover. While recording his services to the nation I am bound to give the other side of the picture, as I fear there is but too much truth in the statement of a biographer, that "interest was the pivot upon which the whole of his actions turned, and a disgraceful versatility marked every step of his political career. However base was the part he acted, he supported it with unabated effrontery. He was meanly ambitious of emoluments as a politician, and contemptibly mercenary as a patron." This was the Duke immortalized by Scott in "*The Heart of Mid-Lothian*." He was created Duke of Greenwich, and commanded the Royal forces in the Rebellion of 1715. He and his brother died without male issue, and the English title expired. The Scotch title and estates passed to a cousin (also descended from the Earl who was beheaded at Edinburgh), who was created Baron Sundridge (of Sundridge, near Sevenoaks), in the peerage of England, by which title the Dukes of Argyll still sit in the House of Lords.

XLVIII.

The Cowpers.



KNOW of few families with a more honourable record than this. The services they have rendered to the country have been rather solid than brilliant, but they appear to have acquired their extensive possessions in a legitimate manner, and I could have wished that there had been no hereditary pension to mar the completeness of their fair fame. The founder of the family was a certain Alderman Cowper, of London, who flourished in the reign of Queen Mary. His son, whose seat was at Ratling Court, Kent, was created a baronet. Besides Ratling Court, which was bought by either Alderman Cowper or his son, I find various lands in Kent—at Canterbury, Word, Marley, Cliff's End, Swaycliffe, Fordwick, Wingham, and Overland in the same county—all purchased by the Cowpers at different times. Sir William Cowper appears to have leased Hertford Castle, which he fitted up for a private residence. He and his son were moderate Royalists, and were imprisoned during the Civil War. The grandson, the second Sir William Cowper, was the father of two sons, both of whom became judges, the elder rising to the dignity of Lord Chancellor.

This latter was the chief founder of the greatness of the family. He was a man, to use Lord Campbell's words, "whose reputation outran his promotion, who was a credit to his party, and who conferred lasting benefits on his country." I am not at all disposed to detract from this judgment. William Cowper, having been bred to the Law, married early, in spite of the opposition of his family, and was spurred thereby to exert himself in his profession. His first speech at the Bar was a great success, save that he did not use enough "Lordships" in addressing the Judge, a fault which he soon corrected. At the landing of the Prince of Orange he and his brother joined a Volunteer Corps of Cavalry, which proceeded to the West to join William; but as there was no fighting to be done he resumed his profession, and soon after attracted

the notice of Somers, who strongly advised him to go into Parliament. At the next election Sir William Cowper and his son were both returned for the borough of Hertford. The son soon made his mark in the House, and provoked the hostility of the country gentlemen by declaring that an active, industrious man, who employed £5,000 in trade, was every whit as fit to be a member as a country gentleman of £200 a-year, who spent his time in hawking and hunting and was over head and ears in debt. Soon after, Cowper became a King's Counsel, and successfully prosecuted some of the Jacobite traitors, supporting also the attainder of Sir John Fenwick in the House of Commons.

At the next election he lost his seat at Hertford through a curious incident. At his first election one of his chief supporters had been a Quaker maltster named Stout, who soon afterwards died. Sarah Stout, the daughter of the Quaker, conceived an unfortunate passion for Spencer Cowper, William's younger brother, although he was a married man. She appears to have in vain implored him to live with her, and, on his persistent refusal, in a fit of despair the infatuated girl drowned herself. A report was set on foot that Spencer Cowper, who was the last person seen in her company, had murdered her, and he was in consequence tried for his life. Spencer Cowper, who subsequently became a Judge of the Common Pleas, was honourably acquitted, but the feeling in Hertford was so strong that it was impossible for a Cowper to hope for success at any future election. The result was that William Cowper had to take refuge in the rotten borough of Beeralston. In the Whig Ministry of Queen Anne he became Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, with £2,000 for outfit and a salary of £4,000 per annum. He distinguished himself by breaking through the time-honoured custom of receiving New Year's Gifts from the officers of the Court of Chancery, which had averaged as much as £3,000 per annum. The other Judges, who had been accustomed to receive similar gifts in their own Courts, were thrown into consternation in consequence, but Cowper persevered in setting his face against the evil custom. When the Tories came into power they tried hard to induce Cowper to retain office, and, though the Queen used her personal influence, Cowper met their advances with an honourable and persistent refusal. He had previously taken a prominent part in the Union between England and Scotland, and presided at

the trial of the notorious Dr. Sacheverel. When Anne lay on her deathbed, and the Jacobite intriguers were busily plotting the restoration of Popery and Despotism, Cowper took an honourable part in procuring the accession of the House of Hanover; and soon after the arrival of George I. he became Lord Chancellor. He presided at the trial of the Jacobite lords who were implicated in the Rebellion of 1715. Ultimately he appears to have taken the side of the Prince of Wales in his quarrel with George I., and in consequence was compelled to retire from office. In his later years he opposed the South Sea mania and the iniquitous proposal which was made for levying a special tax on the estates of Roman Catholic landowners. On the other hand, it must be recorded that he was one of the principal promoters of that Septennial Act whose evil fruit we now reap in having a House of Commons of exclusively rich men; and he also was timid enough to oppose the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, in utter contravention of those principles of civil and religious liberty which he otherwise consistently maintained. The first Lord Cowper and his successors have at various times made large purchases of land in Hertfordshire, and early in the present century the old seat at Hertingfordbury, erected by the first Earl, was pulled down, and the present mansion at Panshanger, familiar to the members of working men's clubs, was erected.

The second Earl married the heiress of the Earl of Grantham, who was the son of Auverquerque, one of the Dutch favourites of William III., and a general of no mean ability. What the hereditary pension was granted for it is impossible to say, as the Cowpers had no documents to establish their right to it. However, for over a hundred years the Cowper family, as heirs of Auverquerque, regularly drew from the public revenue £1,600 annually. The pension has since been commuted. The fifth Earl married the daughter of Lord Melbourne, through whom considerable estates in Northamptonshire and elsewhere came into the family. This lady, whose second son by Lord Cowper is the Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, M.P., subsequently married Lord Palmerston. Mr. Cowper-Temple appears to have inherited a considerable property from the latter. The sixth Earl married the daughter and co-heiress of Earl de Grey. The De Grey title and a part of the estates went to the Earl's nephew, the present Lord Ripon; while the Barony of Lucas and the Bedfordshire estates of the De Greys went to his

daughter, the present Dowager Countess Cowper. Wrest Park and other properties in Bedfordshire have been in the possession of the De Greys for more than five hundred years, and were probably spoil of the Norman Conquest. The condition of Silsoe and other villages on the estate speaks well for the kindly disposition of the noble lady who owns it. The Cowpers, though occasionally manifesting the characteristic timidity of great Whig houses, have for the most part been broad and liberal politicians. Earl Cowper owns in—

Herts	10,122	acres . . .	£13,541	rental.
Notts	5,294	„ . . .	8,243	„
Derby	2,787	„ . . .	6,670	„
Kent	2,078	„ . . .	3,484	„
Northampton	1,064	„ . . .	3,986	„
Bedford	217	„ . . .	279	„
Leicester	17	„ . . .	142	„
<hr/>				
Total	21,579	„ . . .	£36,345	„

The Countess Cowper, daughter of Lord William Compton, owns in—

Yorkshire	5,720	acres.
Essex	3,227	„
Wilts	2,536	„
Leicester	896	„
Northampton	3	„
<hr/>		
Total	12,382	„

The Dowager Countess owns 8,888 acres in Beds, and the Hon. W. Cowper-Temple, M.P., in

Sligo	13,384	acres
Hants	5,780	„
York	1,249	„
Dublin	738	„
<hr/>		
Total	21,151	„

The total landed possessions of the Cowpers are, therefore, 55,112 acres.

I have been recently informed that Mr. Cowper-Temple has handed over his Irish estates to Mr. Evelyn Ashley, the next heir, from the laudable motive that he himself was unable to discharge the duties of a resident landlord.

The Spencers.

IN the year 1621 Lord Spencer, a newly-created peer, took the popular side in the House of Lords, whereupon the Earl of Arundel, the then chief of the great Howard family, speaking of certain events which had occurred a few hundred years before, apostrophising Spencer, said, "My Lord, when these things were doing your ancestors were keeping sheep." "When my ancestors were keeping sheep, as you say," retorted Spencer, "your ancestors were plotting treason." I must say I like that rejoinder. Why should a man be ashamed that his ancestors were breeders of sheep and cattle? So were the patriarchs; so were the shepherd kings. Better far to win wealth by raising food for man than by destroying men's lives. For the *dilettante* agriculturist lords, whose patronage of farming is nothing more than a sham, it is impossible to feel anything else but contempt; but the real farmer lords, whose love of agriculture is hearty and genuine, deserve to be spoken of with honour. They have had no small share in the advancement of agriculture to its present position; would that the few that now belong to that class would not only encourage good farming on their own estates, but do sturdy battle for such a reform in our land laws as would render the actual cultivator of the soil independent of the caprice, or stupidity, or tyranny of Landlordism. The landed possessions of the Spencers lie principally in Northamptonshire, and are distributed as follows:—

Northamptonshire . . .	17,030 acres . . .	£30,533 rental.
Herts	2,878 „ . . .	4,129 „
Norfolk	2,526 „ . . .	2,632 „
Bucks	759 „ . . .	1,635 „
Leicester	671 „ . . .	1,328 „
Flint	390 „ . . .	1,964 „
<hr/>		<hr/>
Total	24,254 „ . . .	£42,221 „

In point of fact the Spencers have three peerages, the Dukedom of Marlborough, the Spencer Earldom, and the Churchill

Barony; the second I have already dealt with under the head of the Churchills, and the third is an offshoot of the second. Perhaps the highest glory of the house, after all, is that they can boast that the author of "*Faërie Queen*," though born at the East-end of London, was descended from the same stock—"a house of ancient fame," as he tells us, even in the days of Queen Elizabeth.

Whether or no the Spencers are descended from the great family of the Despencer, who played such a prominent part in the reign of Edward II., is doubtful. The founder of the line was John Spencer, who was apparently a wealthy grazier in Warwickshire. In the reign of Henry VII. he purchased Wormleighton, in South Warwickshire, and Althorp, in Northamptonshire, the latter of which subsequently became the chief seat of the family. In the next reign we find this same John Spencer purchasing the manors of Brington, Wykedyve, and Wyke Haman, in Northamptonshire, besides other properties. Sir John (he was knighted before his death) was succeeded by his son, Sir William, and two years after by his grandson, the second Sir John, who, like the grandfather, was a great breeder of sheep and cattle. He was succeeded by a third Sir John, and he, in turn, by his son Sir Robert, who seems to have followed the good old ways of his fathers, for one writer declares that "he made the country a virtuous court, where his fields and flocks brought him more calm and happy contentment than the various and unstable dispensations of a Court can contribute, and when he was called to the Senate he was more vigilant to keep the people's liberties from being a prey to the encroaching power of monarchy than his harmless and tender lambs from foxes and ravenous creatures." Of all the peers created by James I. I know of no other to whom such words could be fitly applied; but then the other peerages of James were acquired by purchase or favouritism, that of Robert, first Baron Spencer, by neither. Throughout his career he was a steady supporter of the popular cause, as also was his son and successor, who had previously acted with the patriotic party in the House of Commons. The third Lord Spencer married Lady Dorothy Sidney (Sacharissa), sister of Algernon Sidney, whose beauty was painted by Vandyck and sung by Waller. In the Parliamentary struggle he adhered to the party of Pym; but at the outbreak of the Civil War he appears, like Falkland, to have been the victim of Monarchical

superstition, unlike the nobler Constitutional Royalists of the Hampden type, who feared not to draw the sword against a tyrant. He joined the bodyguard of Charles, and by that monarch was advanced to the Earldom of Sunderland, and fell on the same field of Newbury as Falkland. We need not wonder at finding these two noble men in the camp of those who hated their deepest convictions, but it is strange that the Tories of our time cannot honour their memory as we do, without glorifying a cause which they themselves would have blushed to defend.

Of the son and successor of this Earl I would willingly say nothing, but the prominent part he played in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. has made the evil fame of Sunderland notorious to all readers of the history of that time. "In this man," says Macaulay, "the political immorality of his age was personified in the most lively manner—cunning, supple, shameless, he was free from all prejudices, and destitute of all principles." Of all the statesmen of that period, none is more despicable. Besides the emoluments and peculations of office, he received an annual bribe of £5,500 from the King of France, and he consented to the appointment of Tyrconnel as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in consideration of receiving an annuity of £5,000 from the Irish revenues. In most of the arbitrary actions of James II. he was a willing accomplice, and even proclaimed himself a pervert to Romanism to please his master. Yet soon after, he opened up communications with the Prince of Orange, through the lover of his own wife. Subsequently he was taken into the confidence of William, though he seems more than once to have made overtures to the exiled king.

His eldest surviving son and successor, Lord Charles Spencer, whose acquaintance many of my readers will have made in an unfavourable manner in the popular play of *Clancarty*, was an active member of the Whig party, and played a prominent part in the politics of the days of Anne and George I. At the bursting of the South Sea bubble he was accused of taking £50,000 stock without paying for it, a charge which Lord Stanhope discredits, but which other historians consider proved. His second wife was one of the two daughters of the Duke of Marlborough, and his eldest surviving son eventually succeeded to the Marlborough title and estates, as well as to the Sunderland Earldom.

The youngest son acquired the Spencer property, which had to be relinquished by the elder, who had become Duke of Marlborough. The grandmother, the old Duchess of Marlborough, bequeathed to the former the greater part of her immense accumulations, acquired by means I have already described when speaking of the Churchill family, and from her was derived the greater part of the Hertfordshire estates. His son was created Viscount Spencer. The second Viscount was a Whig, who held several prominent offices, but was a man of no marked ability. His son, Lord Althorp, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the ministry of Earl Grey, took an honourable part in carrying the first Reform Bill. He seems to have been more at home on his own estates than in the House of Commons. At the death of his father he retired from active political life, and devoted himself, like a true Spencer, to agricultural pursuits. To his honour be it recorded, that he, one of the greatest authorities on agriculture, was one of the first landowners to endorse Free Trade principles.

L.

The Bute-Stuarts.



THE heads of the three different branches of this wealthy house share between them no less than 176,102 acres of land, distributed as follows:—

The Marquis of Bute .	. 116,668 acres .	. £233,933 rental.
Lord Wharnccliffe .	. 21,641 „ .	. 34 672 „
Lord Stuart de Decies .	. 37,793 „ .	. 16,368 „

The two former may be described as rich beyond the wildest dreams of avarice, for their wealth is out of all proportion to the acres which they own. In France, in Germany, in Austria, in Italy, in Spain, mines can only be worked on a concession, or lease, from the State, and the owner of the surface of the soil has not even a preferential claim to the concession of a lease, on the principle laid down by Turgot that until minerals are extracted or appropriated they are nobody's, and that they belong to the proprietor of the surface only if he has spent labour or its worth upon them. In this island, however, the rights of landowners to reap where they have not sown and gather where they have not strawed, are pressed to the most extravagant extent. We grumble much if the collier who risks his life daily earns a shilling or two more than a bare subsistence—we lament that those who have expended their capital in coal-mining gain such small profits in these times; but we never think of the great coal lords.

“*Avito viret honore*”—He flourishes in an honourable ancestry—so runs the proud motto on the escutcheon of the Crichton-Stuarts, although they have at least one ancestor whose evil fame might well cause the descendants of many a malefactor to look down on them with scorn. At least there is not a Bute peasant descended from an honest, God-fearing, industrious race, who might not disdain the pedigree of the wealthy Marquis. The Stuart race have well supplied the House of Lords with their numerous bastards, and among the number are the Crichton-Stuarts. King Robert II. had

an illegitimate son, John Stuart, to provide for whom he erected the islands of Bute and Arran into a county, of which John was appointed hereditary Sheriff, with enormous grants of land. Such is the foundation of the house. They never conquered their Scottish estates by the sword or bought them with money; they owe them simply to the fact that their founder was the bastard son of a King. They owe the Bute Peerage itself to an ancestor who, early in the reign of Anne, was appointed one of the Commissioners to treat for an Act of Union. The attempt was abortive, but Stuart obtained his peerage, and, three or four years after, he strongly opposed the Act of Union which was then passed. His grandson, the third Earl, is only too well known to history.

The present Prime-Minister has expressed his strong admiration of the conduct of George III. in the earlier years of his reign; it may be, therefore, useful to consider the kind of Government which he honours with his special approval, and the kind of Minister who then presided over public affairs. Bute was a man of mean abilities, who had managed to ingratiate himself with Frederick, Prince of Wales, and on the death of Frederick, with the Princess. The relations of the two were so equivocal as to give rise to no little scandal. Bute and the Princess had the management of the education of the young Prince (afterwards George III.), which was purposely neglected, it being their intention to perpetuate his minority and virtually to rule in his name. At the accession of George III. Bute became all powerful, and though neither by genius nor by training had he the qualities of a statesman, he was not long in appointing himself to the post of Prime Minister. In a few years an overwhelming outburst of public indignation compelled him to retire. "The great object of his policy," says Burke, "was to secure to the Court the unlimited and uncontrolled use of its own vast influence, under the sole direction of its own private favours; so that Government might be carried on without any concurrence on the part of the people." Mr. Massey is still more severe. He declares that "Bute's resignation was happily accompanied by the final retirement from public life of that notorious Minister, whose practised hand had lately been employed in carrying through the Government measures by such violent and shameful means as would in sterner times have cost him his head."

By Bute the arts of bribery and corruption were carried to

a height before unknown. The revenue was squandered in purchasing seats and votes in the House of Commons, so that, though the Civil List was £800,000 a year, the Ministry had to demand of the House half a million for the payment of the King's debts—in other words, to vote the payment of the money with which a large number of the members had been bribed. A regular market for the purchase of votes, at £200 and upwards, was opened by Bute, who expended as much as £25,000 on a single division, while such members as money could not purchase were subjected to the most rigorous terrorism. He even bought addresses of approval from Corporations, £500 being the lowest price, while the City of London was in vain tempted with the offer of £14,000. The King, too, was induced to treat with studied insult the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Rockingham, and other influential statesmen; while the Press was persecuted in the most unscrupulous manner. It was no wonder that the mob, in their anger, burnt a jack-boot and a petticoat as emblems of Bute and the Princess.

In the height of his power Bute commenced a splendid mansion in London, and, having purchased a house at Luton Hoo, to which he added a park of 1,300 acres, he set about enlarging it and filling it with the choicest treasures of art. His downfall, however, interrupted his plans. The London mansion was abandoned, and the vast designs of Luton were never completed. This lavish expenditure was, rightly or wrongly, attributed to his command of the public purse, and Bute shrank in terror from the hatred he had aroused. The mansion, which had passed into other hands, was destroyed by fire about thirty years ago. Bute married the daughter of Mr. and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and the Wortley estates passed ultimately to his second son, the founder of the house of Wharnccliffe.

The son of Bute (who was afterwards created a Marquis) obtained a pension of £7,000 per annum. Doubtless, not a few of my readers, who have read of the connection of the Bute family with Cardiff Docks and Cardiff Castle, have wondered how this Scotch house acquired their great property in Glamorganshire. The property was derived by marriage. The first Marquis married a daughter of the last Viscount Windsor. Thomas Windsor, a son of the Earl of Plymouth who had fought in the campaigns of William III., was elevated as Viscount Windsor to the Irish Peerage by that Monarch.

He married the daughter and heiress of Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, and it was his granddaughter who brought the Glamorgan property into the Bute family. Of the evil history of the bastard line of the Herberts I have already treated in a former chapter. The mineral wealth of South Wales and the industry of its people have, of course, immensely increased the Bute revenues of Glamorganshire. The last Marquis, and the trustees of the present one during his minority, have greatly accelerated the growth of these revenues by the construction of the Bute Docks, at an expense of more than a million sterling.

I said that the Earl of Bute, the Minister of George III., married the daughter of Mr. and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Wortley and Wharncliffe forest, in South Yorkshire, had been in the possession of the same family almost ever since the Conquest, the Wortleys being originally subinfeudatories of a superior lord. In process of time the Wortleys grew in importance by marriages with neighbouring heiresses, their estate at the beginning of the sixteenth century being valued at £112 11s. 4d. annually. Mr. Wortley Montagu, a man of literary tastes and enlightened views, fell in love with the daughter of the Duke of Kingston, but he had imbibed the rational views of *The Spectator* against primogeniture, and resolutely refused to settle his estates upon an unborn eldest son, who, as he said, might prove utterly unworthy, an idiot or a villain. The Duke was as obstinate as the lover, and refused to allow his daughter to be married to a man with such "fanciful notions." However, the lady proved to be of quite as determined a temper as her father, and the lovers made a clandestine match. The sequel proved that Mr. Wortley Montagu was right, for his only son proved a great source of trouble to him, and he carried out his principles by leaving the son only an annuity of £1,000 per year, and the great mass of his property to his daughter, the Countess of Bute. The Wortley estates were bequeathed by the Countess to her younger son, whose son was created Baron Wharncliffe.*

The founder of the Stuart de Decies branch of the house was Lord Henry Stuart, fifth son of the first Marquis of Bute,

* A correspondent stated that the Wortley estates came into the possession of the Montagus by the marriage of the Hon. Sidney Montagu with Anne Newcomen, *alias* Wortley, illegitimate daughter of Sir Francis, second and last baronet of Wortley.

who married the daughter and heiress of the last Earl of Grandison. The ancestor of the Earl of Grandison had the good fortune to be the brother of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of James I. The major part of the Grandison property, however, was derived from a marriage with a Fitzgerald heiress. Into the origin of their title it is unnecessary to enter, as almost all Irish landed property has been derived from confiscation at one time or another.

A younger son of the first Marquis by his second wife, a daughter of Mr. Coutts, the banker, was the late Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart, for some years M.P. for Marylebone. The zeal with which Lord Dudley Stuart supported the cause of freedom, both at home and abroad, ought not to be forgotten. The exiled patriots of downtrodden nationalities, particularly those of Poland, ever found in him a warm and generous friend.

The Stewart-Murrays.



THE enthusiastic reception of Mr. Gladstone by the Manxmen has directed the attention of many to the Isle of Man, and has recalled to my own mind an episode in its history with which the house of Athol was intimately and discredibly associated. The name of Stewart is one of evil fame. As soon as we read it we are at once prepared for a record of successful crime, and the Stewart-Murrays are no exception to the rule. The Duke of Athol, who has no less than fifteen titles, is the owner of 194,640 acres in Perthshire, rental £40,658. The first of the race was not a Scotchman, but a Fleming, whose name was Freskin, and who came over to Scotland in the reign of David I., receiving from that monarch considerable grants of land in Linlithgow. In those early times the Kings of Scotland ruled in the South alone; in the North they possessed no real authority. No doubt the men of the North were turbulent enough, and had good cause for being so. Sir Walter Scott argues out the whole controversy in the well-known dialogue between Roderick Dhu and Fitz James in "The Lady of the Lake."

"Those fertile plains, that softened vale,
Were once the birthright of the Gael;
The stranger came with iron hand
And from our fathers reft the land.
Where dwell we now? See rudely swell
Crag over crag, and fell o'er fell.
Pent in this fortress of the North,
Think'st thou we will not sally forth
To spoil the spoiler as we may,
And from the robber rend the prey?"

In the year 1130 the then King of Scotland was anxious to subdue the men of Moray, and deputed Freskin to accomplish the task. The stranger succeeded in the expedition, and his forcible robbery of the lands from the ancient possessors was,

of course, confirmed by a Royal grant. Thus was the greatness of the house of Murray founded in spoliation.

A descendant of Freskin was created Earl of Tullibardine. His son obtained the office of Hereditary Sheriff of Perthshire by Royal grant; the amount that his descendant pocketed when heritable jurisdictions were abolished I am unable to state. The Duke of Argyll, by the way, whose heritable jurisdiction was not worth more than £20 a year to him, obtained £22,000 in hard cash from the taxpayers as compensation. The second Earl of Tullibardine married the only daughter of Stewart, last Earl of Athol of the old line, and obtained a new patent from Charles I.—a new patent conferring the Earldom of Athol upon his descendants, one of whom was created Marquis of Athol by Charles II. The Marquis married the only daughter of the seventh Earl of Derby, of which marriage I shall have more to say hereafter. The second son of this marriage was created Earl of Dunmore, and his son, engaging in the rebellion of 1745, was condemned for high treason. Like other Murrays of whom I shall have to speak, he escaped the consequences of his crime, and his descendant, the present Earl of Dunmore, owns 60,000 acres of land in Inverness and 4,620 in Stirling, rental £11,161. It is as well, while the grievances of Highland crofters are being discussed, to know the antecedents of these Highland lords.

The second Marquis of Athol was created a duke by Queen Anne. Several of his sons were dyed deep in the treasons of the two Jacobite rebellions; but, unlike many of the ignorant peasants whom they led into trouble, they contrived to escape the usual punishment of the crime. In the Rebellion of 1715 three of the four surviving sons of the Duke took up arms for the destruction of the liberties of their country. The eldest and youngest succeeded in escaping to the Continent; the third, whose offence was still worse, as he was an officer in the King's Army, was sentenced to be shot as a deserter, but obtained a pardon. In 1745 the two exiled sons returned, and succeeded in raising the Athol tenantry in revolt against the House of Hanover, which had dealt so mercifully with their brother. The elder was captured, and soon after died in the Tower of London; the younger again succeeded in effecting his escape. It looks as if the Murrays had determined to keep the Athol lands, whichever party triumphed, for though the Athol tenantry were led into the rebellion by

two of the Duke's sons, the remaining one took no ostensible part in either rebellion; and he, at the death of his father, succeeded to the dukedom. As we shall see hereafter, it would have been a fortunate thing for British taxpayers if the whole of the Murrays had turned traitors, so that we should have been rid of them once for all.

Ultimately the son of one of these Murrays, whose double treason cost the lives of some thousands of loyal Englishmen, succeeded to the Dukedom, and, having a numerous family, fathered them upon the country. Beside several descendants in the Services, he had no less than seven sons and grandsons who were well provided for in the Church. One of his sons became a dean; another Bishop of St. David's. The eldest son of the latter became Bishop of Rochester, Dean of Worcester, and Rector of Bishopsbourne, all the three preferments being held at the same time. One of this reverend pluralist's brothers was Rector of Southfleet, in the Diocese of Rochester it should be noted, annual value £523; another was Rector of Chislehurst, also in the same diocese, annual value £487; and another was Rector of Stone, also in Kent, annual value £345. The Bishop seems to have taken good care of his brothers. The second son of the Bishop of St. David's obtained the Rectory of Northolt, £682 and a house, and a fat Prebend in St. Paul's. Oh, these lords! they were enough to murder all the churches in Christendom. Thank God, the Church of England is no longer dying of dignities.

I must pass on now to recount the story of one of the most scandalous frauds ever perpetrated upon a long-suffering nation. In the reign of Henry IV., Sir John Stanley, ancestor of the house of Derby, obtained a grant of the lordship of the Isle of Man, on payment of a fixed rent of £101 15s. 11d. to the Crown, the revenues being then worth £400 a-year. As I have stated, one of the Murrays married the only daughter of the seventh Earl of Derby, and, after some litigation, it was decided that the Isle of Man lordship went with the female line. In 1765 the Crown purchased the Duke of Athol's rights for £70,000. In the debates that took place in Parliament upon this business, in 1805, it was stated that the Duke had formerly farmed the revenues of the island to a Liverpool merchant for £1,000 a-year, and Lord Ellenborough went further, and stated that, at the time when the

purchase was made by the Crown, the net revenues were only £800 a-year, according to official documents. It would, therefore, appear that the Duke of Athol had made a good bargain; in fact, Mr. Wilberforce read to the House of Commons letters from both the Duke and the Duchess expressing their satisfaction with the bargain made. But, soon after, the Duke petitioned for a pension of £2,000 a-year on the lives of himself and the Duchess, and his petition was granted; the result being, as Lord Ellenborough stated, that, up to 1805, the Athol family received £177,000 more than the public as the result of the bargain.

Now comes the most astounding part of the story. Seven years after the Duke of Athol was dead, his son had the audacity to petition for further compensation, but his petition was of course rejected. Seven years later he tried it on again, and the petition was rejected by William Pitt. Fourteen years later he made a third attempt, and, as his parliamentary support was needed by the Government, this time he was more successful. A Bill was actually passed granting to the Athol family a perpetual annuity of one-fourth of the gross revenues of the Isle of Man, or £3,000 per annum, with a good prospect of increase. In vain was the Bill denounced by Earl Temple and Mr. Windham as "a scandalous job"; in vain did even Lord Eldon, then Lord Chancellor, declare that it was a dangerous precedent; in vain did men so widely opposed in politics as the Marquis of Buckingham, Mr. Wilberforce, Lord Ellenborough, Mr. Windham, and even Lord Sidmouth, oppose the monstrous demand of this ducal cormorant, whose agents personally canvassed the members of the House of Commons. The Bill passed, and among those voting against it in the Lords beside the peers I have mentioned, were the Duke of Clarence (afterwards William IV.), the Duke of Norfolk, and other leading peers.

From 1804 to 1825 the Duke of Athol received his annuity, and then an Act was passed enabling the Treasury to advance a sufficient sum to enable the Crown to purchase the said annuity. The record in "Burke's Peerage" runs thus:—"His grace disposed of his remaining property and privileges in the Isle of Man to the Crown for the sum of £409,000"! The Duke's crest is a demi-savage holding in his right hand a dagger—a brigand holding in his right hand a pistol would have been more appropriate.

Since that time the Murrays have been content to rest upon their laurels. The late Duke made himself ridiculous about thirty years ago by endeavouring to shut up Glen Tilt against tourists, for which he was deservedly lampooned as a dog in the manger by *Punch*. The present Duke is known only to fame by the Dunkeld Bridge Dispute. It is said that his ancestors, having obtained an Act of Parliament many years ago to build a bridge at Dunkeld, empowering them to advance the money needful and to charge tolls till the money and interest were repaid; his Grace still continues to charge toll, and refuses to furnish any accounts, although there is reason to believe that the original outlay and interest have been paid long ago. Into the merits of this controversy I cannot pretend to enter, as I have never been able to hear the Duke's side of the matter—if there be a Duke's side of it. Considering the origin of the Athol property, it would be interesting to learn whether there are deer forests on his estates, and whether there have been any evictions thereon.

Lest I should be charged with forgetfulness, I may mention that the Murrays, Earls of Mansfield, are descended from the same stock as the Stewart-Murrays of Athol, but that branch of the family must be dealt with in some subsequent paper. I should also add that in 1783 the Duke of Athol attempted to sell the Athol Volunteers to the East India Company; but the men rebelled, and thus saved their liberty.

Michael Doyle

26th Dec 11

24th Dec 24

2nd Dec 16

Cut - 100

Cut - 100

3 Cut - 100

2 Cut - 100

Since that time the Murrays have been content to rest upon their laurels. The late thirty years ago by endeavoured to attract tourists, for which he was the manager by *Punch*. He gained fame by the Dunkeld ancestors, having obtained a grant of land ago to build a bridge across the river, the money needful and interest were repaid; he refused to furnish a guarantee, and to believe that the origin of the matter was long ago. Into the matter, as I have never entered, as I have never entered the matter—if there be any origin of the Athol people, whether there are deer on the estate, or have been any eviction.

Lest I should be charged that the Murrays, Earls of Dunmore, have the same stock as the Stewarts, of the family must be supplied, I should also add that in 1746 the Athol Volunteers rebelled, and thus

8th June 1846
 Earl of Dunmore
 25
 Earl of Dunmore

Chief Justice
 Dundee 26th June 1846

8th June 1846

The Courtenays.



THE Courtenays are of the bluest of blue blood. They carry back the history of their line to a time when even the Howards and Nevills were unknown, and they have intermarried with not a few Royal houses. From the reign of Robert, son of Hugh Capet, the barons of Courtenay—a place about sixty miles south of Paris—were immediate vassals of the Crown. They took a prominent part in the Crusades, one of them actually conquering for himself a province on the banks of the Euphrates, of which his son was dispossessed by the Turks. Another, who remained at home, is described by Gibbon as “a public robber, who stripped and imprisoned several merchants ;” but in those days most barons were brigands. This person—Reginald de Courtenay—had a daughter, whom he married to a younger son of Louis the Fat, of France. Their eldest son married the sister of the Counts of Flanders, the two first Emperors of Constantinople ; and his two sons, as Gibbon informs us, “successively held and lost the remains of the Latin Empire in the East. To support the expenses of a troubled and transitory reign, their patriarchal estates were mortgaged and sold, and the last Emperors of Constantinople depended on the annual charity of Rome and Naples.” Gibbon significantly adds, “Nor can an opulent peer of Great Britain be inclined to envy the Emperors of Constantinople, who wandered over Europe to solicit alms for the support of their dignity and defence of their capital.”

The first Courtenay who appeared in England was a Reginald, and he is supposed by some to have been the same Reginald described as above by Gibbon as “a public robber,” who after the death of his first wife came over with Eleanor, Queen of Henry II., and by that monarch was married to a Devonshire heiress. The son of Reginald became Baron of Oakhampton and Viscount of Devonshire, and married the daughter and heiress of Vernon, Earl of Devon. The ancestor

of Vernon, Richard de Riviers, obtained a grant of Tiverton and the Barony of Plimton, and the third part of the revenue of the county, from Henry I. Vernon, who derived his name from having been born or brought up at Vernona, in Normandy, gave in marriage his daughter, who was his *sóle heir*, to Sir Robert Courtenay. The second Earl of Devon of the new line married a granddaughter of Edward I. At the outbreak of the Wars of the Roses the Courtenays sided with the Lancastrians. The sixth Earl was beheaded by Edward IV. after the battle of Towton; the seventh was beheaded at Salisbury; the eighth fell at Tewkesbury, as did also the heir presumptive to the title. The son of this last obtained from Henry VII. a grant of most of the estates with the title. His son married a daughter of Edward IV., and was created Marquis of Exeter, but was judicially murdered by Henry VIII., and his lands confiscated. Lord Courtenay, the son of the Marquis, who was for a long time confined in the Tower, was expected to marry Queen Mary, or, if not, her sister Elizabeth. He appears to have been a weak, vain, foolish youth, whose character has been fairly depicted in Tennyson's "Queen Mary." After engaging in an abortive conspiracy he went abroad, and, dying at Venice, with him the elder line of the Courtenays expired.

The existing line of the Courtenays—the Courtenays of Powderham Castle, Devon—are descended from a younger son of the second Earl of Devon of the older creation. Powderham Castle, which anciently belonged to the Powderham family, on the death of the last of the race, was granted to Bohun, Earl of Hereford, who gave it to his daughter on her marriage with the Earl of Devon, from whom it passed to Sir Peter Courtenay, a younger son, knighted by Edward the Black Prince. Sir Peter's son Philip made a fortunate marriage with a Devonshire heiress, by which his estate was much increased. The Devonshire estates of the family now amount to 20,588 acres, besides which they have 33,100 acres in Limerick, total rental £43,761. Hitherto in speaking of Irish estates I have been content simply to describe them as confiscated lands, but it is worth while to go into particulars with regard to the Courtenay acquisitions, as a sample of the rest.

In the reign of Elizabeth there was a certain Sir William Courtenay, of Powderham Castle, possessed, like other Devonshire men, with an adventurous spirit, and thoroughly un-

scrupulous as to the means he employed. Ireland was close at hand, and, as Froude tells us, several of the Devon and Somerset squires "had already tried their fortunes there, most of them as pirates and privateers." It happened that the Earl of Desmond, head of the great house of the Geraldines, had given some trouble, although "he had kept clear of treason." Elizabeth, who hated him, wished to bring him to trial. The trial was deferred, but he was forbidden to leave England. He attempted to escape, was arrested, and was made to purchase his life by the surrender of all he had. Then it was that some twenty-seven adventurers, of whom Courtenay was one, proposed to parcel out Munster among themselves; to drive away or kill the chiefs; and either reduce the natives to submission or exterminate them. Cecil shrank from sanctioning this frightful injustice, and suggested that they should content themselves with the county of Cork; but they demanded the whole coast line from the mouth of the Shannon to Cork Harbour. The scheme was not carried out in its terrible completeness; but some of the adventurers went over and rendered themselves for ever execrable by their inhuman brutalities. Desmond, who had been shut up in Dublin Castle, made his escape, and, after raising a revolt, made his submission once more, and was allowed to keep most of his lands. A second time he was forced into revolt by his relatives, and, after being hunted for some time upon the mountains, a party of English soldiers tracked him to a small hut, and murdered him in his bed. So perished the last Earl of Desmond, a man apparently more sinned against than sinning; and Newcastle, County Limerick, with a large quantity of confiscated land, was granted to Sir William Courtenay. Sir William appears to have re-purchased the manor of Powderham, which had been long alienated from the family, and henceforth the manor and castle of Powderham have been in the same hands.

The grandson of Sir William was created a baronet by James I., but, disdaining the title, never adopted it. He was succeeded by his grandson, who married the co-heir of Sir Henry Lee, of Ditchley. The next Courtenay was created a Viscount in 1762, and the third Viscount in 1831 established his right to the Earldom of Devon, which had been dormant ever since the reign of Queen Mary.

The Courtenays are a race of confirmed tax-eaters. A grandson of the second Baronet, like many other Courtenays,

went into the Church, and became Bishop of Exeter. His eldest son, who subsequently became Earl of Devon, was provided for until he came into possession of the family estates by being appointed Clerk-Assistant of Parliament and a Master in Chancery, the latter office alone bringing him in a comfortable income of £3,600 per annum. The younger son of the Bishop, Thomas Peregrine Courtenay, who was returned to Parliament for many years by the then dozen electors of the rotten borough of Totnes, had a most voracious appetite. In 1810 he was Secretary to the Board of Control. But the £1,500 a year attached to the office was so manifestly insufficient that three years after he contrived to have it increased to £1,800. But £1,800 was too small a sum to supply his wants, so in 1815 he induced his colleagues to propose that it should be raised to £2,000, and, two years after, he had another £200 tacked on to it. It must not be supposed, however, that this miserable £2,200 a-year was all that this poor relation of the Courtenays had to depend on; he was also agent for the Cape of Good Hope at a nominal salary of £600, but with real profits amounting to about £4,000 per annum. Further, he was principal Registrar to the Land-tax, the emoluments of which office I have been unable to ascertain. In 1825 he retired from his arduous labours, except the Cape of Good Hope agency, on an annual pension of £1,000, which he lived to enjoy sixteen years longer. He must certainly have received over £100,000 for his valuable services in the course of his lifetime. His three sisters, early in life, were well provided for. In 1806 they had a pension of £1,000 a-year between them, and lived to enjoy it for 46, 48, and 59 years respectively—another little trifle of £50,000. Another female relative had also a pension of £300 per annum. As for his sons, the eldest had two fat places in the Treasury and the Customs, the second was appointed Bishop of Jamaica, the two others were provided for in the Army, another in the Navy, and yet another in the Church.

The present Earl, who early in life was appointed a Cursitor in Chancery by the late Earl, who was himself a Master in Chancery, has held office at different times as Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and President of the Poor Law Board, and has recently been appointed head of the Ecclesiastical Commission. There is a movement in Devonshire just now to erect a statue in his

honour, and any of my readers who feel so disposed may contribute a guinea to this laudable object. By-the-way, there was a Courtenay not long ago who was in grievous financial difficulties. If his debts have been paid by the head of the house, the creditors ought, in common gratitude, to forward their subscriptions.

4767

